DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 916 HE 025 753

AUTHOR Galligani, Dennis J.
TITLE Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships, 1984-87, and Achieving Academic Excellence through School/College Partnerships, 1987-90. Qualitative Evaluations of the Curriculum Enhancement Projects Participating in the California Academic Partnership Program.
INSTITUTION California Academic Partnership Program.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 111p.; This document is part of a collection produced under the auspices of the California State University Institute for Teaching and Learning. The CSU/ITL, created in 1988, facilitates a 20-campus systemwide network of faculty affiliates in response to the demand for improved teaching and learning in the college classroom.
AVAILABLE FROM California State University Academic Publications Program, CSU Chancellor's Office, 400 Golden Shore, Suite 132, Long Beach, CA 90802 ($12).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Bound Students; College Preparation; *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Enrichment; Educational Cooperation; Ethnic Groups; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Intermediate Grades; Minority Groups; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Qualitative Research; Secondary Education; State Universities; Student Recruitment; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS California; California State University; *California State University Inst for Teach Learn; *College Teaching and Learning Collection

ABSTRACT

This document contains two studies of California curriculum enhancement projects designed to develop academic partnerships between secondary and postsecondary institutions and improve the academic preparation of students. The first study provides a qualitative evaluation of 20 projects funded by the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) during the first funding cycle (1984-1987). It examines characteristics which contribute to effective partnerships, successful methods for achieving curriculum enhancement goals, methods for reaching specific CAPP project goals, and unintended outcomes. It also outlines recommendations for effective partnership relationships. The second study emphasizes CAPP's role in motivating students underrepresented in postsecondary education due to historical, economic, or geographic factors, and describes a set of 10 curriculum enhancement projects. This study's findings focus on effective administrative structures, promoting faculty-to-faculty interactions, enhancing school curriculum, communicating effectively, involving parents, sharing costs, and ensuring institutionalization. It also concludes with recommendations for effective partnership development. Appendices include California Assembly Bill 2398, lists of CAPP curriculum enhancement projects, and materials used in program evaluation. Contains 14 references. (GLR)

ED 318916

Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships 1984-87

AND

Achieving Academic Excellence Through School/College Partnerships 1987-90

Qualitative evaluations
of the
curriculum enhancement projects
participating in the
California Academic Partnership Program

HE 025 753

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

California State University

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CAPE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning
and
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

The California State University Institute for Teaching and Learning (CSU/ITL) facilitates a 20-campus network of teaching and learning programs in the CSU system. ERIC/HE has entered into an agreement with CSU/ITL to process documents produced by the system and create a mini-collection within the ERIC database.

Major objectives of this initiative are as follows:

- increase awareness of the work of the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning;
- increase access to the work of CSU/ITL affiliates;
- begin to build a subset of information on teaching and learning that supports *The National Teaching and Learning Forum (NTLF)*, ERIC/HE's newsletter;
- encourage use of the ERIC system by CSU/ITL member affiliates and the *NTLF* readership; and
- test a model for collaboration between ERIC/HE and a major higher education system.

All CSU/ITL ERIC RIE citations are tagged with the following identifiers appearing in the IDEN:Field:

- College Teaching and Learning Collection; and
- California State University for Teaching and Learning.

All CSU/ITL citations carry the following statement in the Note Field:

> This document is part of a collection produced under the auspices of the California State University Institute for Teaching and Learning. The CSU/ITL, created in 1988, facilitates a 20-campus systemwide network of faculty affiliates in response to the demand for improved teaching and learning in the college classroom.

Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships 1984-87

and

Achieving Academic Excellence Through School/College Partnerships 1987-90

Qualitative evaluations of the curriculum enhancement projects participating in the

California Academic Partnership Program

by
Dennis J. Galligani

Copyright © 1990
by the **California Academic Partnership Program**
All rights reserved.

This project was funded by the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP), a school-college cooperative effort to enhance college preparation of students in grades 6-12.

PREFACE

At a time of rising expectations for more effective collaboration among schools and colleges, it is important to remind ourselves of what has already been achieved. CAPP project leaders have been partners in 28 CAPP projects funded over the past six years. They are pioneers in the school-college partnership movement who have learned a lot about what makes partnerships work.

These educators learned about partnerships through their experience in CAPP curriculum projects, which reflect CAPP's legislative mandate:

- to provide academic and related services to students in grades 6-12, especially those who are underrepresented in postsecondary education, and

- to increase the involvement of postsecondary educational institutions in enhancing the academic quality of public secondary schools.

At the conclusion of the first cycle of CAPP funding (1984-87) project secondary school educators met with their private and public postsecondary counterparts to explore what they had learned about establishing successful partnerships. The results of that meeting were documented by Dennis J. Galligani in his report *Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships*, published by CAPP in 1987. The results were used to frame the Request for Proposals for the second cycle of CAPP projects, and formed the basis of technical assistance to these projects.

The CAPP Advisory Committee authorized Dr. Galligani to conduct a second study at the conclusion of the 1987-90 projects. The committee was curious to see if the results of the first study were validated by this second group of partnership pioneers and if there were additional learnings which should be communicated to new projects. Dr. Galligani prepared a report on this study, *Achieving Academic Excellence Through School/College Partnerships*. It is based on data gathered at a meeting held in late spring 1990, using a process similar to that used in the earlier study.

Because of the interrelationships of the two studies, the decision was made to include both of them in one document. We believe that both groups of CAPP project pioneers learned valuable lessons about partnership building which should be shared with the new CAPP projects and a wider audience. We are pleased to make this publication available to you.

Our hats are off to the 1984-87 CAPP project partners who ventured beyond the boundaries of the normal professional life to address pressing educational needs across the state. They exemplify the spirit of adventure and dedication of those earlier pioneers who settled the West. We thank them for their contribution to CAPP's success and to the national school-college collaboration movement. We wish new partnerships well as they build on the fine work of these pioneers.

D. H. Kirkpatrick

Douglas H. Kirkpatrick
Chair, Advisory Committee

Deborah Osen Hancock

Deborah Osen Hancock
Statewide Director

California Academic Partnership Program

TABLE of CONTENTS

1984-87 Report: Effective Relationships

Executive Summary 3
Introduction and Background 9
The California Academic Partnership Program 9
The Curriculum Enhancement Partnership Projects 10
Purpose and Format of the Report 10
Purpose of the Report 10
Report Format 11
Findings 13
Characteristics Which Contribute to Effective Partnerships 13
Overview 13
Administrative Structures 14
Faculty-to-Faculty Interaction 17
Successful Ways to Achieve Curriculum Enhancement 20
Meeting the Needs of the Schools 20
Faculty Working as a Support Group 20
Approaches to Reach Specific CAPP Project Goals 23
Targeting Underrepresented Students 23
Institutionalizing Project Activities in the Schools 25
Dissemination of Project Information 27
Formative and Summative Evaluation Elements 28
Utilization of Central Support: Advisory Board/Director/Evaluator 29
The Unexpected: Unintended Project Outcomes 31
Primary Unintended Outcomes 31
Secondary Unintended Outcomes 32
Recommendations 35
Characteristics Which Contribute to Effective Partnerships 35
Overview 35
Administrative Structures 36
Faculty-to-Faculty Interaction 37
Successful Ways to Achieve Curriculum Enhancement 38
Approaches to Reaching Specific Project Goals 39
Targeting Underrepresented Students 39
Institutionalizing Projects for Continuation 40
Dissemination of Project Activities in the Schools 41
Formative and Summative Evaluation Elements 42
Utilization of Advisory Board/Director/Evaluator 42
The Unexpected: Unintended Project Outcomes 43
Methodological Design of Qualitative Evaluation 45
Comments About Qualitative Evaluation 45
The Methodology of This Report 45
The Design 45
Project Reports 46
Project Participant Workshops 46
Data and Analysis 47

1987-90 Report: Achieving Academic Excellence

Executive Summary 51
Introduction and Background 55
The California Academic Partnership Program 55
Purpose of this Report 56
Findings 59
Characteristics of an Effective Partnership 59
Effective Administrative Structures 60
Promoting Faculty-to-Faculty Interactions 61
Enhancing School Curriculum 62
Communicating Effectively 63
Internal Communication 63
External Communications 64
Utilization of Evaluation 64
Formative Evaluation 65
Summative Evaluation 65
Effectively Sharing Costs 65
Coordination of Partnerships with Other Change/Reform Efforts 66
Ensuring Institutionalization 67
Advice to Novice Partnerships 68
Academic Preparation for Underrepresented Students 69
Ways to Involve Parents Successfully 71
Unanticipated Outcomes 72
Specific Recommendations to CAPP 74
Recommendations to the CAPP Advisory Committee 74
CAPP Evaluation 74
Recommendations 77
Elements of an Effective Partnership 77
Administrative Structure 77
Faculty-to-Faculty Interaction 78
Facilitating Curriculum Enhancement 78
Communications 78
Internal Communication 78
External Communication 78
Effective Evaluation 79
Sharing Costs 79
Coordination with Other School Reform Efforts 79
Institutionalizing School/College Partnership Efforts 80
Advice to Beginning Partners 81
Enhancing Opportunities for Underrepresented Students 81
Successfully Involving Parents 81
Recommendations for CAPP Advisory Committee and Evaluation 82
Advisory Committee Recommendations 82
Recommendations for Evaluation 82
Methodology 85
Comments About Qualitative Evaluation and Focus Groups 85
The Research Design 86
Analyzing the Data 88

Appendices

A. California Assembly Bill 2398 91
B. List of CAPP Curriculum Enhancement Projects 1984-87 95
C. List of CAPP Curriculum Enhancement Projects 1987-1990 97
D. Characteristics of the California Academic Partnership Program Projects 99
E. Plan for Evaluation Sessions 103
F. California Academic Partnership Program Items for Spring Partnership Evaluation Workshop 107
G. List of Evaluation Workshop Facilitators 109
H. Evaluation Workshop Agenda 111
I. List of Focus Group Facilitators 113

References 115

Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships 1984-87

Qualitative evaluation
of the
curriculum enhancement projects
participating in the
California Academic Partnership Program

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Legislature of the state of California created, in 1984, the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP). The purpose of CAPP is to promote academic partnerships between postsecondary and secondary institutions with the intent of enhancing curriculum to improve academic preparation of students. The Legislature provided funding so that curriculum enhancement model projects, as well as diagnostic testing projects, could be established throughout the state to explore alternative methods which would meet the intent of the legislation. This evaluation report deals with the twenty partnership curriculum enhancement projects funded between 1984 and 1987 by CAPP.

A quantitative evaluation of the specific outcomes of these projects is being carried out by an independent evaluator. The CAPP Advisory Board requested a qualitative evaluation be conducted to supplement the quantitative approach by responding to the following questions:

- What is the best way to realize an effective partnership?
  - What is the best administrative structure?
  - What is the best way to promote postsecondary faculty working with schools' faculty?
  - What are the best incentives for interinstitutional cooperation and how can interested faculty be identified?
- What is the best way to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum?
- What is the best way to target academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students?
- What is the best way to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs?
- What is the best way to institutionalize (continue) the partnership effort?
- What is the best way to disseminate information about the project, both within project institutions as well as to external audiences?
- What is the extent to which the CAPP Advisory Board/director/evaluator could be most helpful?
- What other unintended outcomes have occurred as a result of these projects?

A research design was developed, which collected from each partnership project a written report responding to the above questions. In addition, representatives from institutions involved in each partnership project attended a full-day evaluation workshop session which focused on gaining further information about the questions raised.

The findings, as described in Chapter II, of these written reports and the full-day workshops led to recommendations on the best ways to: (1) develop effective partnerships between postsecondary and secondary institutions; (2) promote faculty-to-faculty interaction to enhance curriculum; (3) utilize unintended project outcomes; and (4) meet CAPP specific concerns, including (a) how best to involve underrepresented students, (b) how best to institutionalize the continuation of such projects, (c) how best to share information about the project, both within the project institutions as well as to interested external bodies, (d) how best to evaluate the partnership efforts, and (e) the ways in which the statewide Advisory Board, director, and evaluator could best be utilized.

In Chapter III, both the primary and secondary recommendations are presented. The *primary recommendations*, that is, those which represent a consensus from a significant number of involved CAPP Project partners, are as follows.

Characteristics Which Contribute to Effective Partnership

Overview

It is recommended that partnerships wishing to succeed contain as many of the characteristics suggested below as possible.

- The clear establishment of common goals which are recognized and developed together. One project described this common effort as the generation of "a oneness of purpose."

- The development of mutual trust and respect among faculty: This entails the recognition of teachers as the "experts" in curricular reform.

- The provision of sufficient time to develop and strengthen the relationships both among faculty and administrators: This includes unstructured time for faculty to get to know each other and have the time to think together in order to reach a mutual understanding of each other's contribution to the aims of the curricular enhancement effort. Food as a catalyst in bringing people together is seen as an important element.

- The quality and commitment of the individuals, both in administrative and teaching roles, who have primary responsibility for development of the partnership project are important.

- Continued and constant interaction between "top" management and the faculty directly involved in carrying out the curricular enhancement effort: Reinforcement by top management was seen as crucial, but at the same time, strict oversight by top management was seen to have a negative impact.

- The willingness to recognize and understand the different cycles and languages of the various educational segments: It was considered important to be flexible in dealing with the variety of institutional policies and processes.

- Periodic formative evaluation to ensure that the kinds of activities undertaken are maximized in terms of their effectiveness in reaching commonly and mutually developed goals.

- The need for shared responsibility and accountability among the segments.

- Crisp lines of communication which are inclusive of individuals within project institutions rather than exclusive.

Administrative Structures

Primary Recommendations

- Develop an advisory committee with the following characteristics:

    1. There should be representatives from each institution;

    2. Committee should meet frequently, no less than every other month;

3. Membership should include:

   — Chief executive officer or designee with some level of decision-making and budgetary authority,

   — Curriculum experts, and

   — Faculty from each institution;

4. The committee should see as its role providing direction for planning, implementing, coordinating, communicating about, resource development and utilization, and periodic formative evaluation of the project;

5. The chair of the committee should be rotated among institutions; and

6. Projects should ensure that each institution has some clear responsibilities and authority for the conduct of the project.

- Clarify goals and expectations

  1. Partners should clarify specifically what it is the project is attempting to accomplish;

  2. Specific goals and objectives should be developed by the partners together and written down;

  3. The specific benefits each segment will realize out of the project should be enumerated;

  4. Expectations should be clearly identified for each institution's responsibility and accountability; and

  5. The way in which decision-making will occur should be articulated.

- Communicate

  Ways should be devised for the advisory committee to inform those within the partner institutions, as well as the school board, of what is occurring. Ways to accomplish this are:

  1. Minutes of advisory committee meetings should be broadly circulated, as should materials generated by the project; and

  2. Occasional open sessions of the advisory committee should be held at different project sites, especially high school sites.

- Identify responsible persons

  1. There should be one project director who spends at least 40 percent of the time managing the project:

     — Responsibilities of project director should be clarified in the person's job description and not be considered as an added responsibility, and

     — It does not matter in which segment the project director is housed.

2. There should be one assistant director at each institutional site whose responsibilities are stated in the individual's job description; and

3. The fiscal agent for the project should be the institution which has the ability to utilize the funds as projected with the fewest fiscal restraints.

Faculty-to-Faculty Interaction

Recommendations on how best to achieve an effective, collegial faculty-to-faculty environment follow:

Primary Recommendations

- Establish incentives.

  1. The most effective incentive is the stipend; approximately $700 to $1,000 per year seems appropriate as based upon curriculum development rates within the district;

  2. Provide release time to participate. This is for both secondary as well as postsecondary participants;

  3. Provide summer opportunities for faculty-to-faculty enrichment;

  4. Provide special perks for secondary faculty, e.g., postsecondary library cards, access to special events, etc.; and

  5. Ensure recognition for involvement in project efforts.

- Plan faculty gatherings to bring postsecondary and secondary faculty together.

  1. Ensure these are often enough to make a difference, at least once every month;

  2. Provide sufficient time to establish rapport and break down barriers;

  3. Ensure that initial gatherings are structured enough to provide presentations by both secondary and postsecondary faculty to help build a sense of professionalism for all involved;

  4. When possible, provide food;

  5. Include an early discussion of the general purpose of the project and the mutual benefits derived from faculty involvement; and

  6. Ensure appropriate staff support to follow up on activities so that progress can be made.

- Identify "key" faculty in secondary and postsecondary institutions.

- Ensure that meetings are conducted on a "professional" level.

  Use as basic assumptions:

  Teachers are the curriculum experts, and

  Teachers are the best persons to teach other teachers.

Successful Ways to Achieve Curriculum Enhancement

Primary Recommendations

- Clarify, focus on, and meet the needs as determined by the schools/school districts.

  1. The curriculum enhancement efforts cannot be imposed on the schools by the postsecondary institution.

  2. Clearly identify the negative consequences of not responding to the needs as identified by the district, and how these consequences impact both secondary and postsecondary faculty.

- Establish a support group setting for postsecondary faculty to work with secondary faculty.

  1. Faculty, working together in teams, must be empowered to develop the curriculum enhancement changes.

  2. A way of proceeding is to work through the existing curriculum and to identify gaps and overlaps, resulting in recommendations which establish the needed connections between secondary and postsecondary curriculum.

  3. These faculty groups need to be provided the kind of support structure wherein "risk-taking" can occur.

Approaches to Reaching Specific Project Goals

The CAPP had specific, complementary goals it was attempting to promote. The partnership projects made recommendations on how best to achieve these.

Targeting Underrepresented Students

The emphasis on enhancing the abilities of underrepresented students to access and succeed in postsecondary education was a primary concern of the CAPP effort.

Primary Recommendations

- Include a complementary tutoring component as the most powerful way to support curricular change efforts for underrepresented students.

  1. Tutoring developed underrepresented students' self-esteem and confidence;

  2. Tutoring components provided an opportunity for successful underrepresented students to serve as tutors and role-models to younger students; and

  3. Tutoring was best implemented in small groups so that peer group learning could occur.

- Involve parents in change efforts. When possible, bring parents on site to understand the importance of curricular connections and college preparatory courses.

- Provide summer academic skill-building programs as part of efforts.

  1. Residential summer programs are preferred, although commuting to local community colleges is also effective;

2. Utilization of postsecondary science laboratories was especially helpful to motivate students in science; and

3. Explore the possibility of providing summer programs for junior high school students prior to matriculation to high school.

Institutionalizing Project Activities in the Schools

Partners suggested that the probability of moving a project from a "soft" money base to part of an ongoing programmatic effort with the involved institutions was increased through this recommendation.

Primary Recommendation

- Combine the partnership efforts into the ongoing school improvement plan.
  - — Best if segments have clear responsibilities which can be continued;
  - — Ensure that during the "soft"-funded time frame internal resources are targeted for continuation; and
  - — Continue including project responsibilities in the job descriptions of director and co-directors.

The Unexpected: Unintended Project Outcomes

The unintended outcomes experienced by CAPP partner projects lend themselves to recommendations for more effective partnership efforts.

- Deliberately consider ways for involved faculty to transfer their focused curriculum development activities to other curriculum outside the project boundaries.
- Faculty involved in the project should determine ways to work with faculty not involved in the project.
- Determine ways to involve the existing student support services at both high school and junior high school campuses to support curriculum efforts.

This report provides a record of the experiences, perceptions, and learnings of those involved in the completed CAPP curriculum enhancement projects, and can be utilized to assist institutions wishing to become involved in partnership curriculum enhancement efforts.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The critical importance of improving the quality of students' academic preparation within elementary and secondary schools is an essential aspect of the "Nation at Risk" report issued by the United States Department of Education in 1983. This report encouraged the states to take a close look at the quality of education within their schools and to take strong measures to enhance that quality. In California a special omnibus educational reform act (Senate Bill 813) was passed in 1983. A year later, complementary legislation, in the form of California Assembly Bill 2398, was passed which put into place the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP). This report is a qualitative evaluation of the first twenty joint school/college curriculum enhancement partnership projects which were funded by CAPP to improve academic preparation. This report describes the experiences, learnings, and recommendations of the partners involved in the twenty projects. These findings suggest positive actions which can occur to enhance the curriculum through partnership kinds of efforts.

The California Academic Partnership Program

The purpose of Assembly Bill 2398 (Appendix A) is "to develop cooperative efforts to improve the academic quality of public secondary schools with the objective of improving the preparation of all students for college." This program was designed to fund model projects that prepare secondary school students for college. The majority of CAPP projects involve college and university faculty working together with high school and junior high school teachers in curriculum development, which is designed to provide students the skills and information needed to make them successful in college. These efforts address improvements in curriculum for grades 6 and above. Besides these curriculum enhancement partnership projects, the remaining CAPP projects are charged with the responsibility of developing and managing the administration of diagnostic tests in college preparatory mathematics and English composition.

CAPP was initially funded in 1984-85 for $1 million, and for each of the following two years at $1.5 million. The funds are allocated to the Trustees of the California State University for administration in cooperation with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Regents of the University of California.

The CAPP curriculum enhancement projects were funded in order to enhance the academic preparation of all students for college, and especially those underrepresented in postsecondary education, by proposing and testing a variety of efforts. A mandatory aspect of these efforts includes collaboration between faculty at postsecondary education institutions and teachers in secondary schools which results in improved curriculum. Projects were encouraged to integrate their efforts with such concepts as those found in the California Model Curriculum Standards, the Statements of Competencies of Entering Postsecondary Freshmen, and the State Department of Education's Curriculum Frameworks. Additionally, the projects focused upon curriculum development approaches which incorporated textbook assessment and curricular material development, diagnostic testing, and teacher/faculty in-service training in subject matter methodology. Finally, there was to be a focus upon student and program outcomes. Such outcomes included increasing student access and success in college, and increasing the numbers of students enrolled in college preparatory programs.

One aspect of the legislation calls for the appointment of an eleven member Advisory Board to "assist in selecting proposals to be funded and developing criteria for project evaluation." The membership of the Advisory Board is made up of two certificated secondary school teachers, including at least one junior high school or intermediate school teacher; two certified secondary school employees with

responsibility for curriculum; one director of a regional consortium participating in the California Student Opportunity and Access Program; two representatives each of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California, with at least one of the representatives being a faculty member; and one representative of the California Postsecondary Education Commission. The Advisory Board serves as an oversight body in the ongoing implementation of CAPP efforts.

The Curriculum Enhancement Partnership Projects

There were a total of twenty curriculum enhancement partnership projects funded for the first three years of the California Academic Partnership Program. The project names and the institutions affiliated with the projects can be found in Appendix B. In addition to these twenty curriculum enhancement projects, there were three diagnostic testing projects which were also funded by CAPP, but did not participate in the qualitative evaluation reported herein.

The twenty projects were evaluated and recommended for funding by the CAPP Advisory Board. The recommendations of the board were approved by the chancellor of the California State University.

Those projects funded represent a diversity of approaches to curriculum enhancement in a number of academic content areas. Appendix D reflects the characteristics of the CAPP projects and shows the diversity of kinds of academic content areas which were undertaken by the projects.

The insight and experience of the partners participating in these curriculum enhancement projects serve as the data base for this evaluation report. The exemplary efforts of the projects in attempting to enhance curriculum for the benefit of students within the state of California is acknowledged and appreciated.

Purpose and Format of the Report

Purpose of the Report

The qualitative evaluation and this report were developed to serve a variety of purposes. The general purpose was to gather the collective perceptions of CAPP curriculum enhancement project partners regarding their successful and unsuccessful experiences in carrying out CAPP curriculum enhancement projects.

Specifically, the purpose of the evaluation was to serve as the documentation of these partner perceptions in order to:

1. Provide a supplement to the CAPP quantitative evaluation report, which is to be based upon measurable outcomes of the intended project goals and objectives.

2. Serve as the basis for the California Postsecondary Education Commission's evaluator, who is charged with doing a meta-evaluation of CAPP, to form judgments about the effectiveness of the CAPP program.

3. Provide a source of advice and guidance to new CAPP curriculum enhancement projects, which began in the summer of 1987. In addition, the report was to serve as a source of information to others interested in conducting similar partnership efforts.

4. Be a source of distribution of information regarding CAPP and its effects.

5. Add to the literature regarding intersegmental partnership efforts.

These purposes were reviewed and approved by the CAPP Advisory Board.

Report Format

This report is divided into chapters. This chapter, entitled *Introduction and Background*, has as its purpose to describe, in general terms, the California Academic Partnership Program, characteristics of the partnership projects which served as the data base for the report, and a description of the purpose and format of the report. Chapter II, *Findings*, details by category the various findings from the qualitative evaluation. In general, the findings are broken down into the following categories: characteristics which contribute to effective partnerships; successful ways partners found to achieve curriculum enhancement goals; ways the partners discovered to reach specific CAPP project goals, including such items as targeting underrepresented students, institutionalizing projects, disseminating information, formatively and summatively evaluating their efforts, and providing advice to the CAPP Advisory Board, director and evaluator; and a description of the outcomes which were unintended when the projects began.

The detailed findings found in Chapter II suggest specific recommendations for effective partnership relationships. These are outlined in Chapter III, *Recommendations*. These recommendations serve as a way of advising those who wish to establish partnership relations.

Chapter IV, entitled *Methodological Design of Qualitative Evaluation*, details the way in which this qualitative evaluation was conducted. Included in this section are comments about the role of qualitative evaluation in assessing programmatic efforts. Additionally, there are *Appendices* with related materials as well as a section of *References*.

It is especially important to note that this report is based upon the learnings, perception, and experiences of CAPP partners. These partners include individuals from each of the segments involved in each of the projects. It includes both their written reports and information gleaned from subsequent evaluation workshops where interaction among project participants suggested additional findings and recommendations. It is the summation of the efforts of the individuals involved in CAPP curriculum enhancement projects which this report addresses.

Chapter II
FINDINGS

Characteristics Which Contribute to Effective Partnerships

The cornerstone of the California Academic Partnership Program's efforts to enhance the academic preparation of students is the cultivation of partnerships between postsecondary education institutions and the schools within California's school districts. Effective collaboration between these segments of education is perceived to be the way in which curriculum could be most satisfactorily enhanced to help ensure student access to and success in postsecondary education. This qualitative evaluation focuses upon identifying the characteristics which contribute to an effective partnership. Presented in this section is an overview of those characteristics as well as an in-depth analysis of two of the primary components of partnership efforts, i.e., the administrative structure and the way in which faculty-to-faculty interaction can best occur.

Overview

The qualitative evaluation suggests that when the following general characteristics exist among partnership institutions, a successful collaboration can occur. These characteristics are:

- The clear establishment of common goals which are recognized and developed cooperatively: One project described this common effort as "a oneness of purpose."
- The development of mutual trust and respect among faculty: This entails the recognition of teachers as the "experts" in curricular reform.
- The provision of sufficient time to develop and strengthen the relationships both among faculty and administrators: This includes unstructured time for faculty to get to know each other and have the time to think together in order to reach a mutual understanding of each other's contribution to the aims of the curricular enhancement effort. The importance of food as a catalyst to bring people together is also seen as an important element.
- The quality of the individuals, both in administrative and teaching roles, who have primary responsibility for development of the partnership projects.
- Continued and constant interaction between "top" management and the faculty directly involved in carrying out the curricular enhancement efforts: Reinforcement by top management was seen as crucial, but, at the same time, strict oversight by top management was seen to have a negative impact.
- The willingness to recognize and understand the different cycles and languages of the various educational segments: Along these same lines, it was considered important to be flexible in dealing with the variety of institutional policies and processes.
- Periodic formative evaluation to ensure that the kinds of activities undertaken are maximized in terms of their effectiveness in reaching commonly and mutually developed goals.
- The need for shared responsibility and accountability among the segments.
- Crisp lines of communication which are inclusive of individuals within project institutions rather than exclusive.

It was perceived that if these characteristics were in place an effective partnership could be realized. Projects pointed out that the establishment of partnerships at this point in educational history is reinforced by the ongoing reform movement which was stimulated in 1983 by the federal government's release of the "Nation at Risk" report and, more specifically, by California's "reform" legislation (SB-813).

The characteristics mentioned above will be described in greater detail throughout this report. In particular, two primary partnership building blocks now will be focused upon. These building blocks are: the types of administrative structures for partnerships which are most effective and the way in which faculty-to-faculty interaction can best occur.

Administrative Structure

An essential characteristic of effective partnerships is the way in which the partners organize to work together. The CAPP projects were asked to identify the most effective way in which administrative structures could be developed in order to maximize the ability for partnerships to succeed. There was a variety of models of partnerships which did work, yet there were four primary characteristics that a majority of partnerships found to be most important in order to have an effective partnership. These four primary elements are: the establishment of an ongoing advisory committee, the development of clear expectations and goals, strong communication channels, and individuals identified as responsible for staffing, developing, and maintaining the partnership effort.

Advisory committees

The primary characteristic, identified by more than three-quarters of the projects as critical for the development of a partnership that works, was the establishment of an ongoing advisory committee. One project deemed it the "cornerstone" of the partners' ability to work together. It was seen as extremely important that the advisory committee meet on a regular and continuing basis, at a minimum of every other month.

Partners recommended that a variety of types of individuals be on the committee. The necessary condition is that each *partner institution* be included. Additionally, the members of the committee should be either the chief executive officers (CEOs) of the respective institutions or CEO-designates with some level of decision-making responsibility.

The committee should be responsible for planning, coordinating, and implementing the partnership efforts. This group, simply by meeting, encourages the continued development of partnership activities. An additional important characteristic was the ability for members to exercise some level of budgetary authority for each of the institutions. It did not seem to matter who chaired the committee, although rotating chairs was seen as beneficial.

The role of the committee member was also determined to be important. It was seen as helpful if curriculum experts as well as high school principals and representatives of the faculty of the postsecondary institutions and secondary schools were involved. Additionally, representation of other "staff," e.g., counselors, support services staff, etc., was suggested.

Such a committee was seen to be essential in order to respond to the problems which are likely to arise among the partners in implementing the 22 project. It was pointed out that initial plans for the partnership needed to be seen as guidelines and that the actual implementation of partnership efforts must be flexible in order to respond to evolving changes, as well as to take advantage of new opportunities.

In order to function most effectively the committee should incorporate an ongoing formative evaluation component, conducted at least annually, but preferably more often. This concept of formative evaluation was perceived as the way of determining whether or not the partnership was succeeding.

The advisory committee structure was seen to be the way in which partners could be kept involved and motivated. A sharing of partner responsibilities in terms of making presentations to the committee and of hosting committee meetings at different institutions helped build the partnership.

Clear goals and expectations

The second primary principle was the importance of clarifying the expectations of each of the partner institutions and the common goals which were to be achieved. It was strongly suggested that very early in the project the expectations and roles of each of the partners be clarified through joint discussion. Included in these discussions should be: what, exactly, the partnership is trying to accomplish and time-lines indicating when specific objectives should be reached. Putting these goals in writing reinforced the clarity of the expectations. Furthermore, this activity was important for defining and delineating what each partner was accountable for, and the way in which each partner would contribute to the ongoing partnership. Also, these clarification discussions often led partners into a better understanding of the responsibilities of the different educational segments in the California educational system. It helped partners realize that the segments combined to make up an educational continuum, where the activities of one segment impacted upon the successful functioning of the other segments.

A further refinement of this goal and expectation clarification is to determine the ways in which the project benefits each of the participating institutions. It was recognized by the projects that partners were involved in these efforts for their mutual benefit. While these benefits varied a great deal, it was important to make clear that each institution had a real stake in the partnership effort succeeding. Determining and making this enlightened self-interest obvious was seen as an important step in building the partnership relationship.

Another aspect needing clarification was the way in which the decision-making would occur. Whether that be by vote, consensus, or an alternative mode was less important than clarifying the way it was to take place. Additionally, the criteria for decision-making should be articulated. One project recommended as a single criterion for decision-making, "What is in the best interests of the students?"

All of the above efforts combine to bring a "oneness of direction" to the partnership effort. It is clear that the establishment of these goals, objectives, and criteria very early on in a partnership project significantly reinforces the potential for partnerships to be successful.

Communications about the project

The third critical element identified by partners was a strong communication network for the project. Information about the project and its implementation should be distributed to faculty members and other interested individuals such as school board members and other members within the institution. Neglecting the communication element of partnerships was suggested as a way to ensure the failure of the partnership effort. One obvious communication tool was the frequent advisory committee meeting. It was suggested that open sessions of the advisory committee meetings should be held so that broad participation could occur. The extent to which communication about partnership efforts was made known to the involved educational communities, especially within the school district, was seen to reduce anxiety about the partnership effort. Such communication efforts should be thought out and carried out by all of the partner institutions.

Identified responsible persons

The final primary structural element recognized by partners is the identification of responsible persons at each institution to direct the partnership. It was suggested that there be only one project director or coordinator, or whatever title is appropriate, for the partnership effort. However, it was seen as essential that each partner institution have an assistant director/coordinator/etc., so that there would

be a linking of individuals responsible for the partnership's efforts. It was also suggested that the director and assistant directors be persons who have a strong interest in these activities and who have the skills and authority to get things done. The CAPP partners indicated that the appropriate role of these individuals be perceived as that of "diplomats."

It did not seem to matter which segment housed the director, but simply that the individual would have the time and the ability to get things done. A further argument for having assistant directors at each of the institutions was that this allowed the partnership to be less dependent upon one individual, especially if that individual should leave.

It was considered important that the individuals responsible for coordinating the project have their responsibilities indicated as part of their job descriptions. Furthermore, recognizing that these efforts take an enormous amount of personal time, it was suggested that somewhere between a 40 percent and full-time project director be designated to implement the project.

A further aspect of the administrative structure was the question of which institution should be the fiscal agent. Partners suggested that the fiscal agent be the institution which has the most flexibility in utilizing CAPP funds.

Recognizing that people really do make a difference, and that partnerships are fragile entities, given the long history of lack of such partnerships among educational institutions, the persons assuming responsibility as director and co-directors are seen as a critical element in ensuring that a partnership can succeed.

The four characteristics described above were seen by the CAPP projects as being the critical elements in developing an administrative structure which enhance a partnership's chance for success. Five other elements were also identified as important to support the administrative structure. These elements should be considered when designing partnership administrative structures. These elements are: selection of partners institutions, sufficient time, organizational support from the top and the bottom, recognition of others' uniqueness, and realization of hard work to achieve an effective partnership.

Selection of partner institutions

Partner projects suggested that effective efforts are more likely to succeed if the partnership institutions have had some history of working together in the past. The extent to which these have been positive relationships certainly enhances the ability to be productive. This does not mean that projects which have no history cannot be successful, but only that projects with some history are more likely to be successful.

Sufficient time

Throughout the partnership effort having enough time to build the partnership relationship and to develop the activities to progress was recognized as an important element. There was no one formula for the amount of time needed, although it was generally perceived that the first phase of goal clarification and building common understandings could take anywhere from three months to a year; the second phase of initial implementation anywhere from six months to two years; the third phase of stable project development from a year and a half to three years; and the fourth phase of institutionalization anywhere from two years to four years. This time frame certainly challenges the structure of three-year pilot projects. While more discussion of this characteristic will be found under the section "Institutionalization," it is important to state here that sufficient time to develop the relationship is a critical ingredient in a successful partnership.

Organizationally supported from the top and the bottom

Partners identified the fact that there must be a balance between support from the administrative "top" and "grass roots" faculty interaction to achieve a successful partnership. Without support from the "top," both symbolically as well as with resources and recognition, partnership projects are not likely to succeed. This was explicitly evidenced in one partnership project where a change of the CEO had a dramatic effect, when an individual who was extremely supportive of the partnership effort was succeeded by one who thought it was not worthwhile. The success of the project was significantly diminished. Therefore, support from the "top," both in postsecondary institutions as well as in the school districts, is seen as a critical factor. One project participant described this balance as the "grass roots must continue to be fertilized and watered by the top to grow and bloom."

Aligned with this "top" support is the importance of allowing the actual individuals most closely involved with the curriculum enhancement aspects of the partnership to be free to proceed as is best.

Recognition of the uniqueness of others

Partners must recognize and accept the differences among the segments. Such things as understanding the other segments' calendar, identifying the differences in institutional philosophy, etc., all help to develop the partnership framework, which must be flexible to meet the individual partners needs and constraints. It was found that it was even important to ensure a common language; for example, "release time" has different meanings among postsecondary institutions and school districts as well as differences among four-year postsecondary institutions and community colleges.

Realization of hard work to achieve effective partnership

Partner institutions must recognize that coordinating these curricular enhancement efforts among various segments takes a great deal of hard work. Often partners indicated that they had not realized the extent to which this effort was going to be so demanding. The differences inherent in the involved segments as suggested by different budget procedures, policies, calendars, and language definitions suggest that hard work is needed to ensure that anything actually occurs. Partners pointed out that hard work was critical to assuring that the partnership in fact succeed. Additionally, they indicated that the outcomes of the hard work were seen as worth the effort put forth.

Faculty-to-Faculty Interaction

The administrative structure previously described provides an environment which supports faculty working with faculty to enhance the curriculum to more effectively prepare students to succeed in postsecondary education. The items described in the section "Administrative Structures" indicate the ways effective administrative support of a partnership effort can occur. The items which follow provide an approach that postsecondary faculty and secondary school faculty can use to develop the partnership relationship among themselves in order to carry out the actual implementation of curriculum enhancement. There are four primary and three secondary elements identified by the CAPP projects which can establish effective faculty-to-faculty interaction. The primary characteristics are: distinguishable incentives, faculty gatherings, the identification of key faculty, and professionalization of the activities.

Distinguishable incentives

By far the most critical element reported that supports the development of faculty-to-faculty interaction was the incentives provided for involvement. While it was important to recognize the mutual benefits which faculty gained from these development efforts, a clearly visible reward and recognition system was seen as necessary.

The most significant factor incentive for stimulating faculty-to-faculty interaction was the stipend. The appropriate amount for a stipend seems to be about what school districts have established for curriculum development rates. This tended to be somewhere between $700 and $1,000 per year.

The second most commonly cited incentive was release classroom time. It is imperative that secondary school faculty have the opportunity to participate in these curriculum enhancement activities as part of their staff development. This means that they need time away from the classroom and that appropriate substitute faculty be provided. For postsecondary faculty, especially community college faculty, the incentive needed to be release time from other duties. Often the ability to find a mutual time when faculty could be released from the different institutions was a problem.

The next most often suggested incentive was bringing faculty together at different sites. These visits to other campuses, where in-service training, curriculum, and instructional assistance were carried out, was an important incentive.

Another incentive identified by faculty was involvement in summer programs. This was seen as especially powerful when faculty could be brought together for even as few as three or four days in the summer to discuss curriculum issues. Yet another incentive was the provision of special perks, such as postsecondary institution library cards, access to special events, etc.

While a variety of incentives were commented upon, the important thing is to identify and make available incentives for those faculty involved in the curriculum effort. Partners do not see it as reasonable to expect faculty to participate only out of their personal concern for these efforts.

Faculty gatherings

The second most frequently cited way to encourage faculty-to-faculty interaction was the use of faculty gatherings. These may include such formats as forums and retreats. Bringing the faculty together in sufficiently small groups to be able to discuss common areas of interest was especially effective. This needs to be done not just once, but consistently over a period of time to be effective. It was commented upon earlier in the findings that the partnership's efforts had to meet the different institutions' calendars and unique timing constraints in order to be effective. The importance of assuring that these kinds of activities occurred was described by one partner as, "The faculty forums provide the opportunity to get the teachers off campus for a day, provide them with a day of lunch, conviviality, collegiality, and open discussion."

A commonly mentioned and strongly supported component of these get-togethers was the availability of food. It was described over and over again that luncheons and snacks go a long way toward bringing people together. Faculty themselves described the importance of "getting away and breaking bread together." This did not seem to require anything elaborate, but simply an opportunity to have sufficient informal time to get to know each other. It should be noted the CAPP funding restrictions precluded their use in purchasing food or beverage. Partner institutions utilized their own or other resources to provide refreshment for these sessions.

Within these faculty forums it was recognized as important to avoid a common stereotype held by many secondary faculty, and that was the "elitist" nature of the postsecondary faculty. Comments garnered by the evaluation made it clear that the "intellectual arrogance" of postsecondary faculty could severely hinder the project. It was incumbent upon postsecondary faculty to break down the barriers erected upon that perception and, thus, to ensure the ability to work with secondary faculty on curriculum issues. Partnerships were most successful when postsecondary faculty recognized that "the best teacher of teachers is a fellow teacher," and also that teachers are "the curriculum experts." One suggestion to overcome this dilemma was having early discussions between postsecondary and

secondary faculty on the common purposes of the efforts and to discuss what each faculty member sees as important about the project. The professionalization of these discussions was seen as a most critical factor.

Another way to break down the "elitist" expectations and attitudes was to discuss with the faculty the mutual needs addressed by these curriculum enhancement efforts. When this occurred, it often resulted in the bringing together of the faculty on an equal footing, each recognizing the others' special areas of expertise and interest. Ensuring that all faculty understand why they are participating and their roles in the effort seemed to help positive faculty-to-faculty interaction.

Identification of key faculty

The third primary element in strengthening faculty-to-faculty interaction was the early identification of "key" faculty at both postsecondary and secondary institutions. These faculty should be carefully selected for their leadership qualities and their legitimate interest in the partnership purpose. It was suggested by many partnership institutions that having such individuals begin the project lends a great deal of credibility to the partnership effort. Providing these individuals with clearly defined responsibilities and appropriate staff support to carry them out was cited as very important. It was also important that the activities suggested by the faculty be carried out. This ability to follow-up, mainly through the dedication of staff support to the faculty interaction, is again one of the critical ingredients in ensuring that effective partnerships actually occur.

Another characteristic in the utilization of key faculty was providing these individuals the opportunity to visit each others' campuses, as well as to visit other model projects. It was suggested that key faculty from a variety of curriculum enhancement projects be brought together to discuss ways in which these efforts can occur. This inter-project sharing of information recognizes the importance of the key faculty, creates a closer bond among project faculty, and reinforces the activities of the model projects.

Professionalization of the activities

The final characteristic seen as primary by the projects was the reinforcement, in whatever way possible, of the professional nature of these activities. Built into these efforts must be a strong recognition of the role of the teacher as curriculum expert. Additionally, the professional contributions faculty are making at their individual institutions, and as model curriculum projects which can be replicated by others, must be acknowledged.

These four characteristics were determined to be those most responsible for promoting positive faculty-to-faculty interaction. The three other characteristics stated are: understanding institutional protocol, utilizing research opportunities, and clarifying expectations.

Institutional protocol

Faculty, as well as involved administrators, need to be aware of the differences among institutions and the way in which things get done. This understanding of institutional protocol and language among faculty should be a specific topic in the early faculty discussions.

Utilizing research opportunities

It was found useful for postsecondary faculty to consider the ways in which involvement with secondary faculty in curriculum enhancement could be used as a research opportunity. One project found it particularly successful for the secondary faculty to work with postsecondary faculty as coauthors of the articles coming out of the curricular projects. This approach lends itself to the identification of mutual benefits and to the enhanced professionalization of the project efforts.

Clarifying expectations

Projects pointed out that care must be taken to establish false expectations among faculty. There have been many efforts at curricular enhancement, many efforts to promote change within schools. A crisp understanding of the goals of the project and the cooperative development of the project's objectives cooperatively are ways of limiting false expectations. One way suggested to being a project was to start slowly, involving faculty in a very specific task rather than pushing faculty to be involved, very early on, in an in-depth, ongoing basis. Projects which took this route discovered that faculty were very willing to become more involved later once they could see some progress being made related to their own activities and contributions.

Successful Ways to Achieve Curriculum Enhancement

The CAPP projects had as their main goal enhancing curriculum in order to achieve better academic preparation of students interested in pursuing postsecondary education. The characteristics described in "Characteristics Which Contribute to Effective Partnership" set forth ways in which administrators and faculty can build partnership relationships to work together. This section deals with specific ways curriculum enhancement was seen to be most successfully achieved. There were two primary ways in which curriculum enhancement most appropriately occurred, as well as a number of secondary characteristics. The two primary characteristics include meeting the needs of the schools and faculty working together in support groups. Those elements seen as less essential but still helpful include: involving the right set of individuals, clarifying the importance of consistent curricular connections, utilizing successful models of curriculum enhancement, targeting resources, ensuring the flexibility of the approaches, and assessing the potential impact of the external environment on these efforts.

Meeting the Needs of the Schools

If successful curriculum enhancement is to occur, CAPP partners strongly suggest that the approaches must attack specific, readily identifiable areas of need within the school district. The determination of these needs must be made by the school district. While this may seem obvious, it was vitally important. The schools had to be meeting their needs versus postsecondary institutions using the schools as a research project for particular studies.

Over time, within the partnerships where success occurred, districts came to realize that they had an extremely valuable resource in postsecondary institutions willing to work with them on specific curriculum enhancement projects. Secondary schools saw these efforts not as an intrusion, but, in fact, as an invaluable resource to enhance the way they could provide an effective curriculum for their students. Once again, it was not only important for the district to determine the needs but, additionally, for these needs to be clearly recognized and communicated throughout the district and in its schools.

Another aspect of the clarification of needs was to raise the awareness of the partners about *why* there was a need for change. It had to be made clear to those involved that these efforts were not simply an experiment, but that there was a distinct reason for attempting to enhance the curriculum, whether it is to increase the numbers of students continuing in postsecondary education, to raise test scores, etc. In order to most effectively enhance curriculum, a clear understanding of why it is important was considered essential.

Faculty Working as a Support Group

The second element seen as primary in assisting school districts to enhance curricula is the development of faculty support groups based upon the assumption that school faculty members are the curricular experts. This concept of faculty working with faculty to enhance curricula was, of course, one of the fundamental concepts which stimulated the adoption of CAPP and its programmatic elements.

One CAPP project, describing the importance of the support group mechanism in promoting lasting change, reported, "Only if teachers feel the need, and experience encouragement for their efforts, will what goes on behind the classroom door be enhanced or significantly changed in a lasting way. Mandating change is definitely not the way to get anything accomplished. Rather the idea of faculty working with faculty supports the ability to actually enhance curricula." Another project suggested the importance of the interaction of postsecondary and secondary institutions in this way, "Multi-institutional involvement gives diversity, helping us and them to better understand each other."

Along with this notion of the support group function is the way in which faculty must necessarily be responsible for the essential outcomes of the effort. This was indicated with a project reporting that change will only occur when "it empowers those who participate in the change. The curriculum must be, in a sense, newly developed by each group of teachers who will teach it."

One of the projects reported specifically the way in which they envisioned the enhancement of the curriculum occurring. They suggested these steps:

— Meet together with university staff (not always faculty) to decide what should be done;

— Decide who to consult (including university faculty);

— Decide what to develop;

— Put (faculty) into groups to write materials;

— Present ideas and materials to each other and model suggested teaching methods;

— Pilot test the materials;

— Meet to discuss successes and failures and revise, revise, revise;

— Visit each others classes; and

— Present ideas to other colleagues.

Candor among faculty is essential at this stage to develop trust within these work groups. Secondary teachers indicated that feedback from their postsecondary colleagues must be candid and constructive at this point in time.

Projects noted that one way to approach curricular change is for the faculty support groups to work through the existing curricula structure and identify areas where the connections between the curricula and the expectations of the faculty are lacking. Projects also noted the importance of using California's curricular competency statement, developed by the Academic Senates of the three California Post-secondary Education segments. The *Statement on Competencies in English and Mathematics Expected of Entering Freshmen* is one example of these statements.

A final element noted, which enhances the development of this group support, is the provision for those involved of an environment in which they can take risks. Trust must be developed among participants so that experimentation can occur.

These two elements were seen as the primary elements in assisting a school district to enhance its curriculum through faculty working with each other. Additionally, the following elements were also seen as important.

- It was important that a variety of individuals be involved to work with the faculty. For example, district curriculum personnel should be involved; additionally, the school principals, and where available, school content specialists also should be involved.

- Another aspect which enhanced curriculum development was the inclusion of junior high school faculty to work with the secondary and postsecondary institutions' faculty. The need for curricular connections was identified as necessary across the boundaries of junior high school to high school, as well as from secondary schools to postsecondary institutions.

- It was indicated that problems can occur among the faculty who do not participate in these kinds of activities. It was urged that all faculty be kept informed of the efforts, and, to the extent possible, to involve faculty who wish to participate in these curriculum change efforts. Ways to accomplish this were suggested, such as presentations to school faculty and drafts of materials circulated for comment. One project indicated that their lack of keeping faculty involved severely hindered their efforts. They encourage projects to anticipate obstructionists among the faculty. The project observed that obstructionists are "unwilling to change the status quo. They see change as empowering those who participate in the change; therefore, they insist upon trying to ensure that no changes can be made." Planning for this type of blockage can help ensure the success of the partnership efforts.

- One other factor identified by partnership projects was ensuring that the faculty involved in the project realize the extent to which their teaching impacts upon their students' college preparation. This can be made explicit through discussions among the postsecondary faculty and secondary faculty regarding the importance of students' academic preparation. This activity lays the ground work for making the academic connections by indicating that their teaching has a direct impact on the success of students at the postsecondary institution.

- Projects indicated that it was useful to have models of successful curriculum enhancement presented to them. While these were not to be incorporated verbatim, they were useful as far as they could be extrapolated for an individual project. Another useful tool was any research report or experience of outside-of-the-project secondary teachers in curriculum change. Once again, it was not necessary that the research be utilized as envisioned by the project, or that the individual experiences were identical, but rather, it served as a point of discussion and provided an opportunity to explore ways in which outside information might be useful within the individual institutional environment.

- Projects noted the catalytic function that grant funds, such as CAPP, provided in stimulating these curricular activities. Simply the fact that there were additional resources available to encourage partnership activities, outside of institutional resources, was seen as a positive enhancement to curricula development.

- Projects did note that there was no one model that worked for all projects. Some projects started in only one specific curriculum area, while others dealt with a variety of curricular enhancement activities. The key ingredient seemed to be the extent to which administrative support was provided, district needs were clearly defined, and an environment for faculty-to-faculty interaction was established.

- A number of projects observed that, even with the desire and motivation to enhance curriculum within the district, often the external environment can preclude any effective change. Such activities as union led work stoppages were pointed out as having the ability to cripple these kinds of efforts. Projects indicated that, to some extent, such mechanisms as the advisory committee, described in the section "Characteristics Which Contribute to Effective Partnership," can serve to ameliorate some of the external threats to successful enhancement.

Approaches to Reach Specific CAPP Project Goals

The California Academic Partnership Program had specific goals it wished to reach through the utilization of partnerships to enhance curriculum. Among these goals was to target the efforts on students who are underrepresented in postsecondary education within the state of California. Additionally, programs, such as CAPP, which establish a number of diverse project sites, attempt to identify ways to help ensure that projects can be successful. For CAPP, those characteristics included the ways in which such projects could be institutionalized; the ways in which information about the project should be disseminated, both within the project environment, as well as external to it; ways in which both formative and summative evaluation could best occur; and the ways in which "oversight" bodies such as boards, the program director, and evaluators can best assist the development of the projects. "Approaches to Reaching Specific Project Goals" describes the ways the CAPP projects suggested are best for executing these specific project goals.

Targeting Underrepresented Students

The legislative intent of CAPP is to enhance the ability of all students, but most specifically underrepresented students, to be more academically prepared for postsecondary education. This preparation would allow them better access to, as well as success in, postsecondary institutions. Selection criteria for the partnership projects targeted geographical areas where large numbers of underrepresented students could be served. Therefore, part of the question regarding how underrepresented students could be targeted was already answered through the CAPP selection process of the school districts. The qualitative evaluation identified ways in which underrepresented students could be encouraged to become involved in these efforts. These ways involved, for example, providing complementary support services of special class sections. There were three primary and eleven secondary ways reported by the projects on how best to involve underrepresented students. Additionally, some of the positive outcomes of this targeting were noted. The three primary ways include special tutoring, parental involvement, and summer programs.

Specialized tutoring

Projects found involvement of underrepresented students to be most effective when special tutoring efforts were established. They discovered that, when done appropriately, tutoring complemented the curriculum changes and built self-confidence among underrepresented students. If the tutoring was provided by other underrepresented students, an additional benefit was achieved by providing successful role models for the targeted student population. Along these same lines, it was discovered that small group tutoring was much more effective than individual one-on-one tutoring.

A problem was identified in assigning students to the tutoring groups if limited resources existed. Projects suggested that the best way to remedy this was to randomly select students. This gave an opportunity for all students to participate and avoided the concept of putting students into "tracks," which most projects saw as extremely debilitating to the academic success of underrepresented students.

Parental involvement

Projects indicated that the involvement of parents was extremely critical to enhancing the accomplishments of the underrepresented students involved. If parents were well informed about students' needs as well as sensitive to the overall success of the project's efforts, they made a positive contribution to the overall success of the project. Additionally, some projects indicated it was worthwhile to involve community members and community associations to support these special efforts. It was suggested that project advisory committees look for additional resources from the local community to support their curriculum enhancement efforts.

Summer programs

The primary enhancement strategy to serve underrepresented students was providing summer programs for these students. Some projects indicated that these programs were most successful when the students could reside at the postsecondary institutions; others found that the summer programs were most successful as commuter programs at the local community college. The important factors were having an intensive summer academic effort and bringing the student to the postsecondary site. Additionally, it was noted that involving students in the postsecondary institution's science laboratories often demystified the notion of science and, in fact, increased students' interest in scientific inquiry. Similarly, it was learned that the summer between completing the eighth grade and beginning high school was a very effective time to provide a summer basic skills program. There has been much "summer bridge" work offered for students entering postsecondary institutions, and the partners suggested that this concept be expanded for students entering high school.

Besides these three primary elements for assisting the targeted underrepresented groups, a variety of other factors were discovered. These include: enhanced self-image, perceptions of students who succeed, focus on critical college preparation courses, coordination with other underrepresented student efforts, utilization of college with other underrepresented student efforts, utilization of college role models, transitional courses between sixth and seventh grade, teacher referrals, counselor referrals, attractiveness of project, and raising the consciousness regarding underrepresented students' needs.

Enhanced self-image

Projects discovered that involvement in these special efforts enhanced the students' self-image, especially as it related to success in postsecondary education. It was noted that this enhancement occurred only after continued and sustained contact. It was felt that involvement in these efforts for at least two years was essential to build the kind of trust which enhanced a student's self-image.

Perceptions of individuals who are successful

Another outcome was the extent to which students, who had a clear sense of what was expected of them, showed that they could succeed at college preparatory work. Often this surprised faculty who stereotyped underrepresented students and their academic abilities. This finding reiterated the observation that "tracking" within high schools becomes a way of developing stereotypes about the ability of students to succeed.

Critical college preparation courses

Partners noted that an essential means of enhancing the ability for underrepresented students to succeed was to specifically target the curriculum enhancement effort on the critical college preparatory courses. This included both a review of course content as well as the sequence of these courses. Students were quick to recognize the extent to which the courses involved in the partnership effort, in fact, could lead them to success within the college environment.

Coordination with other underrepresented student efforts

Another suggestion for involving underrepresented students was to tie the partnership project into the underrepresented student support efforts often available on the campus. For example, the University of California's Early Outreach Program was seen as an important link for CAPP efforts on campuses. On the other hand, involvement with CAPP projects can serve to focus the Early Outreach Program on academic preparation efforts which go beyond their traditional role. Tying curricular enhancement efforts into ongoing programs can significantly strengthen both programs' ability to assist underrepresented students.

Utilization of college/university role models

The ability for the curriculum enhancement project to involve university and college students as role models for the secondary students was seen as a desirable and critical element in motivating underrepresented students when they are at a point in their lives, attempting to decide whether or not postsecondary education is worth the effort.

Transitional courses between sixth and seventh grade

Some projects experimented with a transitional class for academic preparation between sixth and seventh grades. This became an obvious extension of the concept of summer bridge programs for postsecondary institutions and the previously mentioned high school preparation program. The class could provide students with some sense of orientation and with an introduction to the academic expectations of junior high school. One district stated that it was working to identify students between the third and fourth grades, believing this to be a critical time to begin college preparatory efforts.

Teacher referrals

Effective identification of students to participate in these efforts was seen, in some cases, to be directly related to the willingness of faculty to refer students. These referrals were intended to include not just high-achieving students, but also to include a variety of students who exhibited the potential to succeed. One project extended this concept to the junior high school where faculty were committed to early identification of underrepresented students for supplementary programs; again, a broad range of students were identified.

Counselor referrals

Counselor referrals, like faculty referrals, were identified as effective. Utilization of both faculty and counselors was seen as the best way of involving underrepresented students in special curricular efforts.

Attractiveness of project

Projects indicated that making these efforts as attractive as possible stimulates the students' initial involvement. One project described this notion as "a little glitz and fun doesn't hurt."

Raising the consciousness regarding underrepresented student needs

Having a project which focuses on underrepresented students was found by some partners to effectively serve as a consciousness raising activity for faculty and administrators about the specific needs of underrepresented students. Their involvement with this kind of curriculum enhancement project and complementary activities led to broader discussions on identifying and satisfying the academic needs of underrepresented students.

Correspondingly, some projects indicated that by responding to specific underrepresented student needs, they became aware of the many differences across the cultures of underrepresented students. Both the differences among underrepresented cultures as well as other aspects such as American-born versus immigrant status became apparent. One partner institution asserted that these discoveries led to a better understanding of cultural diversity by faculty and staff within the school district.

Institutionalizing Project Activities in the Schools

One of the understandable concerns when "grant" dollars are provided to support enhancement projects is the extent to which the project continues after the "soft" dollars are removed. This was a concern of CAPP. While the quantitative study will determine how many projects actually did continue, the qualitative evaluation looked at how institutionalization of the project activities could be enhanced

through specific programmatic efforts. One primary and three secondary suggestions were made by the partnership projects. The primary aspect was to include the curriculum efforts as part of the institution's ongoing efforts. Included in the secondary recommendations are the degree to which trust has been established, the importance of the reasons to continue, and early recognition of the developmental phases such a "soft" funded project goes through.

Ongoing efforts

The majority of CAPP projects indicated that the best way in which institutionalization could be accomplished was for the programmatic efforts to be tied into ongoing curriculum reform. One project stated specifically that curriculum enhancement efforts should be "part of the school improvement plan." Comments were made that institutionalization would occur if clear responsibilities of each segment were established quickly in the project and if ownership of these activities has resulted.

A second reinforcer of institutionalization is to what degree other institutional resources have been targeted to assist the curriculum enhancement effort. A third way is to include the curriculum enhancement responsibilities as part of individual job descriptions.

The viability of these support efforts is also determined by the extent to which evidence exists that the project has been effective. Both quantifiable information as well as a "sense" of the quality of the project need to be made known. It also was found that when top level management was informed about the project and had received some kind of recognition because of the partnership effort, the effort was likely to continue.

Furthermore, institutionalization was more likely to occur when goals and objectives for institutionalization were developed *during* the conduct of the project. This, again, was reinforced if the partnership idea is compelling and believed in by those involved. It had to be seen that the CAPP project goal was tied into the institutional purposes and was not simply an add-on activity.

A final way to reinforce institutionalization was to ensure that the public relations individuals from the partner institutions be kept informed and involved. This helps keep the project activities in front of both the school district and the external community.

The degree to which trust has been established

There were three secondary elements regarding the way institutionalization can best occur. The first of these was the extent to which trust had been developed by the faculty and administrators involved in the project. One project stated this element as, "We have begun a tradition, which I hope will keep going, of your (school district) bringing teachers to the conferences to report on the progress you have made incorporating critical thinking into your curriculum. This is a way for us to maintain our relationship in future years." Trust and mutual benefit will help carry these efforts into the future.

Rationale to continue

Another factor the CAPP projects identified as improving the success of institutionalization was the extent to which *some* money was carried over from external sources to continue the project efforts. It was indicated by a number of projects that this need not be a great deal of money, but simply an amount that could be used to reinforce the continuation of the project. This suggestion argues for setting aside a small amount of money for a final year to support projects involved in CAPP and similar curriculum enhancement efforts. Projects noted that it was very difficult to continue in the absence of special funding. Some projects did indicate that one way to continue was to garner other grant support.

CAPP deliberately set a policy of reducing the dollar amounts to individual projects by a certain percentage each year. Projects generally felt that this policy did advance the institutionalization of the project; however, it was not enough to institutionalize the project by itself.

Recognition of the developmental phases

One project indicated the importance of recognizing, up front, that there are three phases in institutionalizing such projects. They described them as:

— Implementation phase, of approximately three years, the success of which is dependent upon the specific people involved.

— Initial institutionalization phase, of two years, which is less personality dependent as new staff become trained to assume project responsibility.

— Institutionalization completion phase, concluding after many years of project activity, which incorporates the project's activities into the fabric of the partnership institutions.

This plan suggests an ongoing phase-in. The experience of partners suggests that there is no magic time line for these activities, but that activities which focus on the institutionalization from the beginning of the project are an important aspect of actually carrying out successful institutionalization.

Dissemination of Project Information

Disseminating information about the project has a number of effects. When dissemination was effective, it was seen to serve both as a catalyst for project activities and a reinforcement of the fact that institutions were working together. This, in turn, served as a stimulus to continue the curricula enhancement activities. In the qualitative evaluation two aspects of dissemination were brought out. The first was the way in which dissemination within the project occurred and, second, how dissemination to external audiences occurred.

Internal project dissemination

There were two primary and four secondary ways in which effective dissemination of information was carried out by partnership projects. The first primary mechanism was the word-of-mouth, face-to-face, telephone-to-telephone kind of communication about the project among project members. This personal interaction was seen as the most effective way to disseminate information about the project. This was especially true when "key" faculty and administrators were involved. The second primary way was through the utilization of a project newsletter. The content of the newsletter was best when it not only reported project activities but, more importantly, when it reflected items about other partnership-type projects, research in the field, and other "excellence efforts." It was interesting sidelights regarding other curriculum enhancement efforts which seemed to more effectively help reinforce the positive nature of the project's partnership efforts.

There were a number of other ways in which internal dissemination of information was seen to be effective. Primary among these were the ways teachers shared information with other teachers not involved directly in the project. This was seen to be especially effective when high school teachers talked with junior high school teachers. Also helpful was keeping parents informed, either through a newsletter, a letter, or speeches at parent meetings; and keeping the school board informed on a periodic basis. It was found to be helpful when minutes of meetings of the advisory committee were widely distributed across the project institutions. Some projects found that open forums within the schools were effective for keeping people up-to-date. Many projects commented that the most important individual to carry out

the dissemination activities within the schools was the principal, who helped ensure that faculty were kept informed.

External dissemination

There was one primary way partners felt that information about partnership efforts could be transmitted externally. This was to attend appropriate conferences and make joint presentations. It was seen that when colleagues from both secondary and postsecondary institutions were involved in these presentations, it reinforced the collegial aspect of the project while reinforcing its importance.

While the above was seen as the primary means, there were a number of other recommendations on dissemination which the partners saw as appropriate. Among these included partners writing articles and institutional public relations personnel developing press coverage of the various partnership events. One of the more important aspects identified by a number of the projects was the extent to which thoughts about external dissemination of the efforts need to be considered in the project planning. It was recommended that some standard information materials, whether in the form of bulletins or even brochures, be prepared for external audiences interested in the partnership efforts.

Additional suggestions for external dissemination included: newsletters, setting aside a day to invite local interested persons to come on campus to observe the partnership, and participation at community events.

Formative and Summative Evaluation Elements

As explained in Chapter II, the plan for evaluation of CAPP projects was based upon the utilization of outside evaluators to provide the formative evaluation and to set up the summative evaluation components. The execution of this evaluation design did not meet the expectations of the projects nor of the CAPP Advisory Board. Also, as stated earlier, one characteristic which promoted effective partnership projects was ongoing formative evaluation.

In this qualitative evaluation, the partners were asked about how both formative (i.e., developmental) and summative (i.e., results oriented) evaluation could best be conducted. It is interesting to note that there were no suggestions related to either formative or summative evaluation made by a significant number of partners. In the case of formative evaluation, at most, two projects recommended the same kind of evaluation effort; and, in regards to summative evaluation, at most, four projects indicated a way in which summative information could best be assessed.

The outcomes of the qualitative evaluation suggest that the design established by the CAPP board, while conceptionally sound, had a weakness in that it did not encourage CAPP projects to seek out ways in which they should take responsibility for evaluation.

There were, however, some suggestions made by the projects regarding both formative and summative evaluation and these are presented below:

Formative evaluation recommendations

As stated above, there were no overwhelming factors described by any of the projects regarding an effective formative evaluation. However, a number of items were suggested which could be useful for partnership projects to accomplish formative evaluation. Projects indicated that they felt the most effective type of formative evaluation was to conduct immediate feedback after partnership-related events. This helped to devise ways in which future events could be more effective. Another indicator was the number of faculty who became involved in projects and continued their involvement. Related

to this, it was considered important to discuss with faculty the extent to which partnership activities were meeting their needs.

Another dimension to consider was whether or not students were actually aware of the special nature of the curriculum enhancement efforts. One project noted that a sure test of whether the efforts were on target was the extent to which students were enjoying classwork. A faculty member stated, "Now kids are hanging onto my every word when I bring up the revised questions."

Regarding formative evaluation to assess how the partnership is proceeding, one project suggested determining how many meetings were attended, by how many, and the extent to which responsibilities were actually shared among partners. Another aspect of the success of the partnership was its ability to generate additional grant funding for the partnership efforts. Projects also indicate that, to assist the formative evaluation, formalized needs assessments would be useful.

When asked what kinds of individuals should be involved in providing information, partners suggested principals, students, and faculty, including those who did and those who did not participate, as well as parents and administrators.

Summative evaluation recommendations

Once again there was no overwhelming sense of which factors should be used to assess the outcome effectiveness of the project. This reinforces the indication that such measures need to be determined early in the project. Among those items mentioned to assist in the determination of whether the projects were successful were: an increase in the number of students on the University of California's a-f pattern or on a college preparatory track, the success of students in postsecondary institutions over time, and a change in student attitudes toward college. Additional student outcome measures include the students' interest in college preparatory classes, students' interest in pursuing postsecondary education, the increase in attendance and retention rates, and the increase in college applications.

Another aspect of the summative evaluation was the importance of collecting the unintended outcomes of the project. Chapter III, the section "The Unexpected: Unintended Project Outcomes," lists the variety of unintended outcomes that CAPP partnership projects discovered as part of their efforts. It is seen as extremely useful by partners to collect these outcomes on an ongoing basis.

One measure of effectiveness of the partnership is the degree to which the collegial relations started by the partnership effort are continued.

Projects recommended that, where possible, pre- and post-tests be used in a design for summative evaluation; and, to the extent possible, an outside evaluator help the projects establish a viable control group to determine the extent to which the partnership effort is making a difference.

One final comment concerns the extent to which partners reinforced the idea of conducting both a quantitative (outcome) evaluation as well as the qualitative evaluation utilized for this report. It was suggested that such a qualitative effort be convened by CAPP and be utilized throughout the term of the project. Along with project partners, students should be involved in this evaluation approach.

Utilization of Central Support: Advisory Board/Director/Evaluator

As stated in Chapter II, the California Academic Partnership Program was initiated by the California Legislature with an oversight Advisory Board built into the organization of CAPP. Immediately, the board recognized the need for both a full-time director and an evaluator to assist in the development and effective organization for support of CAPP partners' projects. As part of the qualitative evaluation,

questions were raised regarding how both a statewide advisory board as well as program director and evaluator could best be utilized. The findings below reflect the projects' thoughts regarding the effectiveness of these components.

Advisory Board

There were two primary recommendations regarding the utilization of the Advisory Board and three secondary recommendations.

The first primary recommendation was that the board needed to inform the projects specifically of its role and to designate the ways in which the board could be of service to the projects. This would provide a means by which the projects could best utilize the expertise of the board. The second primary recommendation for the board was that it need to be visibly involved in the projects. It was recommended that individual partnership projects needed to, in fact, have a partnership with the board. Joint meetings with the board and the projects were encouraged.

Furthermore, some projects recommended that there be project team meetings with individual board members. These meetings should be both inter- and intra-project as well as with the board. It was felt that these meetings would help support the projects as well as provide valuable information as to the ongoing nature of policies and concerns being identified by the board.

It was suggested individual board members "adopt" specific projects that they would visit periodically. It was believed that these visits would serve two purposes: one, that board members might become aware of what is taking place at the projects, and two, that the visit would help reinforce the importance of the project at the partnership site. A final recommendation was that the CAPP Board be sensitive to the time constraints placed upon the projects. CAPP deadlines should be reasonable and made known in a timely manner.

Program director

The role of the program director is to assist the projects in carrying out their functions. There were once again two primary and two secondary recommendations regarding the utilization of the director.

Primary recommendations revolved around the leadership in identifying and working with the projects to enhance their quality. First, it was suggested that the director be flexible in dealing with the unique aspects of each of the individual projects and become informed so that the director could make known to the board what the individual projects had to deal with and were accomplishing. Second, it was recommended that the director provide timely responses to items agreed upon when the director visits the project. The current director was applauded for her efforts to respond in a timely way to partners' queries.

Two other recommendations were made for the director. They were to make the role of the director clear to the projects, and to define how the director could assist the projects. It was seen that once again this would allow the project to best utilize the director.

The final recommendation for the director was that the director should serve as a clearinghouse for what is happening and what is working at other project sites. This transference of information was seen as an important role that the program director could play.

Evaluator

As stated previously, the role of the internal evaluator was to assist the projects develop their own formative and summative evaluation designs. The original design for evaluation was seen as appropriate

by the partner projects. Helping to clarify individual project objectives was seen as most appropriate. The way in which the design called for an evaluator to assist the projects in development of formative information was also seen as a very useful approach to evaluation. In addition, as stated above, the qualitative assessment of projects as an ongoing evaluation component was encouraged.

There were two primary and a number of secondary recommendations regarding how the evaluator could be most useful to the projects.

The first primary suggestion was for the evaluator to work very early on with the projects to design the way in which both formative and summative evaluations should occur. It was important that the evaluator recognize the uniqueness of each project and negotiate individually with each project on how these would occur.

The second primary characteristic was the importance of speedy feedback to projects when evaluation information is collected by the evaluator.

There were also secondary recommendations regarding the evaluator. These recommendations include: the timely reporting back to projects in terms which allow them to utilize this information effectively and the importance of informing the projects how assessable the evaluator would be for their "use." One project recommended that a workshop on evaluation be provided for project directors very early on in the development in the partnership efforts. Finally, projects suggested that an evaluator could assist with developing selected "control" comparison schools or districts so that the effectiveness of the partnership's efforts were better able to be determined.

The Unexpected: Unintended Project Outcomes

One of the strengths of the qualitative research design was the ability to gather from the partnership participants those outcomes which were an unintended, unexpected part of the project. There were numerous such outcomes, and it was interesting to note that six of the unintended outcomes were experienced by a majority of the participants. An additional twenty unintended outcomes were also described by participants. The extent to which these partnership projects have led to other, mostly positive, consequences in the postsecondary and secondary institutions which were involved is evidence that this kind of effort can have on the entire educational system.

Primary Unintended Outcomes

Below are those unintended outcomes listed by a majority of the partner projects.

1. A majority of the projects indicated that they did not anticipate the extent to which postsecondary faculty would become aware of the curricular and instructional strategies utilized by the junior high school and the high school faculty. Postsecondary faculty were appreciative of the extent to which teachers are truly committed to enhancing the educational outcomes of their students. The efforts reinforced the concept of teacher as leader within the school. As one project stated, "There was a true appreciation for each other as an outcome of these efforts."

2. Another primary unintended outcome was the degree to which information was shared by CAPP-involved faculty with other faculty not directly involved in the project. Teachers who were not involved directly in the partnership project were influenced by those who were involved. Additionally, most projects indicated that more teachers than expected were involved.

3. Both postsecondary and secondary faculty and administrators indicated that an extremely positive outcome was the good friendships and professional respect which developed among colleagues.

The partnership efforts truly led to a breakdown of the "we/they" mode of thinking about individuals in different educational segments.

4. Another unintended outcome was the degree to which collaboration occurred between project faculty and student services in place at the schools. It was reported that a number of student services which were initiated to support the partnership efforts led to institutionalization of those efforts on an ongoing basis.

5. Another strong outcome was the degree to which these projects led to curricular enhancement in other subject areas than had originally been planned. Individuals who became involved in one area of curriculum enhancement used what was learned and transferred it to other areas. This was also seen as materials, which were developed for specific projects, found their way into other curricula by involved faculty.

6. The final primary outcome was the extent to which underrepresented students were, in fact, influenced. It was the observation of many that underrepresented students were much more willing to discuss their ability to "go to college." There was the perception that, indeed, the students' self-image had been improved, and, on the other side of the coin, faculty perceptions of underrepresented students had been positively affected.

Secondary Unintended Outcomes

Beyond the primary outcomes, as described above, there were an additional twenty outcomes described by project participants.

1. Many projects indicated that more students had been served than had originally been planned.

2. One of the outcomes was less than positive, and that was the extent to which the partnership efforts expended more energy than was anticipated. Project participants described frustration when expectations were raised beyond the capacity of the project to achieve them. It was clear that projects became aware that partnerships were fragile and dependent upon the people involved. This realization led to a strong recommendation that expectations for the implementation and outcomes of the project be made clear at the outset of such a project and be assessed in an ongoing way so that the degree of frustration can be minimized.

3. A number of projects indicated that more institutions than were originally planned had become involved in the project.

4. There was unexpected improvement in schools which took place in a variety of ways. A number of projects indicated that statewide test scores had been improved. Projects reported improvement in college board SAT scores. In addition, there was improved visibility and academic prestige of the project institutions. Finally, students involved in the CAPP project efforts were found to become more involved in campus leadership positions. This suggested that their self-image as well as their academic capabilities were improved.

5. A number of projects indicated that they were surprised at the extent to which the partnerships became much more extensive and individuals much more enthusiastic than anticipated. Many more activities occurred than were originally conceived as the partnership effort proceeded.

6. One of the outcomes which assisted the institutionalization of the partnership efforts was that postsecondary and secondary faculty worked together to initiate their own grant proposals to fund

the curriculum projects. This was perceived to be both gratifying and challenging. Partners indicated that faculty felt like a team working together.

7. One of the unanticipated student outcomes was the extent to which students clarified their own career goals and expressed interest in teaching. A number of students who worked as tutors or in other project capacities indicated an interest in teaching as a career. Students were characterized as being happy and involved in the teaching aspects of the project.

8. Both administrators and faculty indicated that through the project, they recognized the tremendous need for staff development and the importance of involving both postsecondary and secondary faculty in staff development efforts. A counter to this positive outcome was the relatively small amount of resources available to meet the significant staff development needs.

9. Projects found surprising, yet positive, that an environment was established where risk taking was acceptable. Many exciting things occurred. Once the partnerships were established, it was perceived as acceptable to try some things out of the ordinary which might be productive.

10. A couple of projects indicated that they had received unexpected national recognition as an outcome of their partnership experiences.

11. It was discovered that materials developed for the curriculum enhancement efforts were extremely useful for the training of temporary and substitute teachers.

12. In a number of cases, promotions occurred as a result of the partnership efforts, although this should not be anticipated.

13. The partnership program, at a number of project sites, helped focus attention on the need for clear articulation of the curriculum between junior high schools, to high schools, as well as from high schools to two-year and four-year institutions.

14. It was seen that there was an expanded commitment of individuals to help serve the needs of underrepresented individuals to help serve the needs of underrepresented students. It was made clear by the project that underrepresented students, when provided the right environment, can succeed. It also became clear to a number of projects of the need to actively engage underrepresented students in their very early years of educational development. Some recognized that this challenge needed to occur as early as the third and fourth grades.

15. One of the projects, which involved a community college working with secondary schools, established a supplemental curriculum transfer-track for underrepresented students. This bodes well for assisting in the transfer of students from community colleges to four-year institutions.

16. In some projects it was found that the partnership efforts brought school counseling staffs together across segments. This had not been done before.

17. In one project the college preparatory efforts at one high school led to districtwide adoption.

18. It was found that the partnership efforts "pushed" the district to interface with outside funding agencies to enhance its ability to continue the efforts.

19. One project added the corporate sector to its partnership. Exploration of this particular component was not seen as part of the original partnership effort, but was one which could be explored in future CAPP efforts.

20. A direct outcome of one of the projects was the development of the now annual California Principals Conference. This conference brings together approximately 1,200 principals from across the state to share expertise and knowledge over a three-day period. Once again, the continuation of this conference will have ongoing impact on educational reform and excellence.

Chapter III
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings described in Chapter II, a series of recommendations can be made about the various aspects of partnership approaches to educational excellence as reviewed through the qualitative evaluation. Those items listed below under *primary* recommendations reflect the consensus of many of the CAPP projects. Secondary recommendations were suggested by one or several projects. Recommendations are presented in the same format as the subsections of Chapter II.

Characteristics Which Contribute to Effective Partnership

Overview

It is recommended that partnerships wishing to succeed contain as many of the characteristics suggested below as possible.

- The clear establishment of common goals which are recognized and developed together. One project described this common effort as the generation of "a oneness of purpose."
- The development of mutual trust and respect among faculty: This entails the recognition of teachers as the "experts" in curricular reform.
- The provision of sufficient time to develop and strengthen the relationships both among faculty and administrators: This includes unstructured time for faculty to get to know each other and have the time to think together in order to reach a mutual understanding of each other's contribution to the aims of the curricular enhancement effort. Food as a catalyst in bringing people together is seen as an important element.
- The commitment of the individuals, both in administrative and teaching roles, who have primary responsibility for development of the partnership project is important.
- Continued and constant interaction between "top" management and the faculty directly involved in carrying out the curricular enhancement effort: Reinforcement by top management was seen as crucial, but, at the same time, strict oversight by top management was seen to have a negative impact.
- The willingness to recognize and understand the different cycles and languages of the various educational segments: It was considered important to be flexible in dealing with the variety of institutional policies and processes.
- Periodic formative evaluation to ensure that the kinds of activities undertaken are maximized in terms of their effectiveness in reaching commonly and mutually developed goals.
- The need for shared responsibility and accountability among the segments.
- Crisp lines of communication which are inclusive of individuals within project institutions rather than exclusive.

Administrative Structures

There were both primary and secondary recommendations about ways to enhance the administrative structure of a partnership project to achieve a successful and effective partnership.

Primary recommendations

- Develop an advisory committee with the following characteristics:

  1. Representatives from each institution;

  2. Committee should meet frequently, no less than every other month;

  3. Membership should include:

     — Chief Executive Officer or Designee with some level of decision-making and budgetary authority,

     — Curriculum experts, and

     — Faculty from each institution;

  4. The committee should see as its role providing direction for planning, implementing, coordinating, communicating about, resource development and utilization, and periodic formative evaluation of the project;

  5. The chair of the committee should be rotated among institutions; and

  6. Projects should ensure that each institution has some clear responsibilities and authority for the conduct of the project.

- Clarify goals and expectations

  1. Partners should clarify specifically what it is the project is attempting to accomplish;

  2. Specific goals and objectives should be developed by the partners together and written down;

  3. The specific benefits each segment will realize out of the project should be enumerated;

  4. Expectations should be clearly identified for each institution's responsibility and accountability; and

  5. The way in which decision-making will occur should be articulated.

- Communicate

  Ways should be devised for the advisory committee to inform those within the partner institutions, as well as the school board, of what is occurring. Ways to accomplish this are:

  — Minutes of advisory committee meetings should be broadly circulated, as should materials generated by the project; and

— Occasional open sessions of the advisory committee should be held at different project sites, especially high school sites.

- Identify responsible persons

1. There should be one project director who spends at least 40 percent of the time managing the project:

   — Responsibilities of project director should be clarified in the person's job description and not be considered as an added responsibility, and

   — It does not matter which segment in which the project director is housed.

2. There should be one assistant director at each institutional site whose responsibilities are stated in the individuals' job descriptions; and

3. The fiscal agent for the project should be the institution which has the ability to utilize the funds as projected with the fewest fiscal restraints.

Secondary recommendations

- Select partner institutions where a favorable history of interaction already exists.
- Allow sufficient time for the project. It takes from three to six years to "fully institutionalize" a curriculum enhancement project.
- Recognize that partnerships are "hard" work.
- Ensure that there is the necessary support from the "top" level of administration.

  — Guarantee freedom for "grass roots" faculty and support staff to be flexible to carry out the project and be responsive to the actualities of a dynamic project environment.

- Take time to recognize and understand the unique characteristics of each partner institution's policies, procedures, and language.

Faculty-to-Faculty Interaction

Recommendations on how best to achieve an effective, collegial faculty-to-faculty environment follow:

Primary recommendations

- Establish incentives.

1. The most effective incentive is the stipend; approximately $700 to $1,000 per year seems appropriate as based upon curriculum development rates within the district;
2. Provide release time to participate. This is for both secondary as well as postsecondary participants;
3. Provide summer opportunities for faculty-to-faculty enrichment;
4. Provide special perks for secondary faculty, e.g., postsecondary library cards, access to special events, etc.; and
5. Ensure recognition for involvement in project efforts.

- Plan faculty gatherings to bring postsecondary and secondary faculty together.

  1. Ensure these are often enough to make a difference, at least once every other month;

  2. Provide sufficient time to establish rapport and break down barriers;

  3. Ensure that initial gatherings are structured enough to provide presentations by both secondary and postsecondary faculty to help build a sense of professionalism for all involved;

  4. When possible, provide food;

  5. Include an early discussion of the general purpose of the project and the mutual benefits derived from faculty involvement; and

  6. Ensure appropriate staff support to follow-up on activities so that progress can be made.

- Identify "key" faculty in secondary and postsecondary institutions.

- Ensure that meetings are conducted on a "professional" level.

  Use as basic assumptions:

  — Teachers are the curriculum experts, and

  — Teachers are the best persons to teach other teachers.

Secondary recommendations

- Ensure sufficient time to explore unique differences in institutional policies, procedures and, language.

- Include the possibility for secondary faculty to become involved in postsecondary faculty's research efforts where possible.

- Clarify project purposes and project expectations.

- Involve faculty in very specific tasks in the early interaction phase and then expand their involvement as support and trust are built.

Successful Ways to Achieve Curriculum Enhancement

Partner projects recommended these primary and secondary ways to enhance the curriculum at the school sites.

Primary Recommendations

- Clarify, focus on, and meet the needs as determined by the school/school district.

  1. The curriculum enhancement efforts cannot be imposed on the schools by the postsecondary institution.

2. Clearly identify the negative consequences of not responding to the needs as identified by the district, and how these consequences impact both secondary and postsecondary faculty.

- Establish a support group setting for postsecondary faculty to work with secondary faculty.

  1. Faculty, working together in teams, must be empowered to develop the curriculum enhancement changes.

  2. A way of proceeding is to work through the existing curriculum and to identify gaps and overlaps, resulting in recommendations which establish the needed connections between secondary and postsecondary curriculum.

  3. These faculty groups need to be provided the kind of support structure wherein "risk-taking" can occur.

Secondary Recommendations

- Include important individuals in these curriculum enhancement efforts, especially the principal (as the school site leader), district and school site curriculum personnel, and, where available, school based content experts.

  — When possible, include junior high school along with high school and postsecondary institution faculty for maximum curriculum congruence.

- Attempt to inform and to include faculty not directly involved in the curriculum change effort.

  1. Hold broadly based presentations regarding the activities of the project.

  2. Plan to add faculty to the curriculum change effort, and/or rotate faculty, if feasible.

- Provide involved faculty information about other successful curriculum change models or about relevant research efforts, while at the same time recognizing that curricular change is specific to each institution or school district.

- Recognize that external environmental factors, e.g., mandatory legislation, work stoppages, etc., can alter the project.

Approaches to Reaching Specific Project Goals

The CAPP had specific, complementary goals it was attempting to promote. The partnership projects made recommendations on how best to achieve these.

Targeting Underrepresented Students

The emphasis on enhancing the abilities of underrepresented students to access and succeed in postsecondary education was a primary concern of the CAPP effort.

Primary recommendations

- Include a complementary tutoring component as the most powerful way to support curricular change efforts for underrepresented students.

  1. Tutoring developed underrepresented students' self-esteem and confidence;

2. Tutoring components provided an opportunity for successful underrepresented students to serve as tutors and role models to younger students; and

3. Tutoring was best implemented in small groups so that peer group learning could occur.

- Involve parents in change efforts. When possible, bring parents on site to understand the importance of curricular connections and college preparatory courses.

- Provide summer academic skill-building programs as part of efforts.

1. Residential summer programs are preferred, although commuting to local community colleges was also effective;

2. Utilization of postsecondary science laboratories was especially helpful to motivate students in science; and

3. Explore the possibility of providing summer programs for junior high school students prior to matriculation to high school.

Secondary recommendations

- Ensure that students are aware that they are involved in curricular enhancement efforts regarding the development of college preparatory skills.

- Efforts are most effective if tied into ongoing services provided on the campus for underrepresented students.

- Encourage faculty and counselors to refer underrepresented students to special programs.

- Encourage transitional academic preparation and college-motivational orientation programs for elementary to junior high schools.

- Attempt to make the project fun; as one project put it, "a little glitz and fun doesn't hurt."

- Targeting underrepresented students for curricular change efforts raises the consciousness of faculty and administrators regarding the special needs of these students.

- Determine the extent to which programs targeted at underrepresented students can later be expanded to include the entire student body.

Institutionalizing Projects for Continuation

Partners suggested that the probability of moving a project from a "soft" money base to part of an ongoing programmatic effort with the involved institutions was increased through these recommendations.

Primary recommendation

- Combine the partnership efforts into the ongoing school improvement plan.

1. Best if segments have clear responsibilities which can be continued;

2. Ensure that during the "soft" funded time frame internal resources are targeted for continuation; and

3. Continue including project responsibilities in the job descriptions of directors and co-directors.

Secondary recommendations

- Develop goals and objectives for institutionalization at the beginning of the project.
- Institutionalization will be a direct outcome of the extent to which trust has been established among partners. If a firm base of faculty trust is developed, the project is likely to continue.
- Design monetary policies to stimulate a move toward institutionalization.

1. CAPP should continue to provide fewer resources to projects each year in anticipation that the institutions will pick up a consistently larger share of project funds; and

2. After the final year of "full" CAPP funding, some money should be made available for one more year. Five thousand dollars to $10,000 was seen as a sufficient amount to continue to stimulate meetings and discussions related to curriculum enhancement.

Dissemination of Project Activities in the Schools

How best to inform individuals within the institutions involved in the partner project, as well as those external to it was commented upon by CAPP projects. There were no recommendations which had sufficient consensus to be "primary."

Internal dissemination

- Utilize word-of-mouth, face-to-face, and telephone-to-telephone dissemination.
- Publish newsletters as an effective dissemination tool. Included in text should be project activities as well as items regarding other partnership models and related research findings.
- Inform parents and school board members.
- Broadly circulate advisory committee minutes throughout the involved institutions.

External dissemination

- Recommend joint secondary and postsecondary individuals make presentations at conferences and other events. This approach provides information and builds bonds of collegiality.
- Consider the way in which external dissemination of project activities will occur as part of the project implementation plan.
- Develop a brochure for those interested in the partnership effort.
- Set aside one day a semester to invite those interested in observing the partnership.
- Ensure that campus public relations personnel are involved.

Formative and Summative Evaluation Elements

Partners were asked to recommend how both formative (i.e., developmental) and summative (i.e., results-oriented) evaluation could best occur. Once again, there was no consensus on items which could be deemed "primary."

Formative evaluation

- Recommend immediate feedback after each event in order to make adjustments for future events.
- Keep track of the number of faculty who participate and continue to participate.
- Determine the extent to which each partner has clearly stated responsibilities and follows through with these responsibilities.
- Determine the extent to which further grant funding is generated as part of the partnership effort.

Summative evaluation

- Recommend the following data elements be collected at periodic intervals:
    1. Number of students on college preparatory track;
    2. Students' attitudes toward college participation;
    3. Student attendance and retention rates; and
    4. Long-range student success at postsecondary institutions.
- Collect unintended outcomes as the project proceeds.

Utilization of Advisory Board/Director/Evaluator

The CAPP project had an intersegmental Advisory Board, a statewide director, and an evaluator to assist in the implementation of the CAPP legislation. While no consensus was reached by CAPP partner projects on recommendations to these involved entities, some recommendations for each were forthcoming.

Recommendations for Advisory Board

- Clarify the role of the board and how the board could be utilized by projects.
- Hold joint meetings with the board and project partners. These meetings should not only include the project directors but also others involved with the project at each institution.
- Establish an annual meeting of participants from the partner projects by region. It would be extremely useful to bring partners together to discuss common progress and problems as well as to discuss how issues are being handled at the different project sites. It is important for project teams to include faculty representation.
- Individual Advisory Board members should "adopt" a project in order to better understand what is occurring on project sites as well as to provide assistance to the project when necessary.

- The board should inform projects of the deadlines for their reporting responsibilities in a timely manner.

Recommendations for Statewide Director

- Should serve as the liaison between board and projects.
- Should serve as the "expert" so that individual projects can look to the director to enhance their effectiveness.
- Clarify the role of the director and inform projects on how to best utilize this person.
- Should serve as a clearinghouse for ideas and research regarding partnerships and curriculum enhancement.

Recommendations for Program Evaluator

- Assist with the development of project's formative and summative evaluation plans.
- Identify ways to set up quasi-control groups to better determine the effectiveness of the project.
- Provide quick feedback to projects after institutional visits.
- Clarify the role of the evaluator and the ways in which that individual can serve to assist the projects.

The Unexpected: Unintended Project Outcomes

The unintended outcomes experienced by CAPP partner projects lend themselves to recommendations for more effective partnership efforts.

- Deliberately consider ways for involved faculty to transfer their focused curriculum development activities to other curriculum outside the project boundaries.
- Faculty involved in the project should determine ways to work with faculty not involved in the project.
- Determine ways to involve the existing student support services at both high school and junior high school campuses to support curriculum efforts.
- Be prepared for the significant amount of effort necessary to carry out the partnership project.
- Think through the ways in which more institutions can become involved.
- Determine the ways in which clarification of students' career goals can be incorporated into the curriculum enhancement effort.
- Plan to utilize the enhanced curricular content for training of substitute and temporary teachers.
- Consider ways in which curriculum linkages between junior high school, high school, and post-secondary education can occur.

- Bring high school and postsecondary institution counselors together to discuss ways in which they can support the project.
- Consider ways to involve the corporate sector to support the project.

Chapter IV

METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN OF QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

This report describes the findings and recommendations of CAPP projects based upon a qualitative evaluation. The specifics of this design are described in this section. Additionally, definitions of and comments about qualitative evaluation are also included.

Comments About Qualitative Evaluation

Besides specific quantitative project outcome information collected from the CAPP curriculum enhancement projects, the CAPP Advisory Board sought to determine the ways in which CAPP partners implemented, and would have implemented, their projects so as to achieve the best results. This examination of the perceptions of partners was carried out through the use of a qualitative evaluation design. Schofield and Anderson (1984) describe qualitative inquiry as having the following characteristics:

a. Is conducted in natural settings, . . .

b. Utilizes the researcher as the chief "instrument" in both data-gathering and analysis, . . .

c. Emphasizes "thick description," that is, "obtaining real, rich, deep," data which illuminate everyday patterns of action and meaning from the perspective of those being studied, . . .

d. Tends to focus on social processes rather than primarily or exclusively on outcomes, . . .

e. Employs multiple data-gathering methods, especially participant observation and interviews, and

f. Uses an inductive approach to data analysis, extracting its concepts from the mass of particular detail which constitutes the data base . . . (pp. 8-9).

Miles and Huber (1984) suggest that "Qualitative data are attractive. They are a source of well-rounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local context" (p. 21). They suggest that qualitative data analysis consists of three concurrent flows of activity. These are data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification.

The CAPP Advisory Board suggested a qualitative study to complement the quantitative evaluation design being carried out by an independent evaluator. The board perceived that gleaning information from the rich experiences of partners would provide a positive adjunct to the learnings about partnership efforts in curriculum enhancement.

The Methodology of This Report

The Design

The CAPP Advisory Board focused the qualitative evaluation on a series of questions. The answers to these questions they felt would provide qualitative information on the extent to which the CAPP

projects were successful, and also on the best way they could be replicated by other projects. The questions were:

What have you learned (pro and con) regarding:

1. What is the best way to realize an effective partnership?
   - What is the best administrative structure?
   - Which is the best way to promote postsecondary faculty working with secondary school faculty?
   - What are the best incentives for faculty cooperation and how can interested faculty be identified?
2. What is the best way to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum?
3. What is the best way to target academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students?
4. What is the best way to evaluate the effectiveness of the project's efforts?
5. What is the best way to institutionalize (continue) the partnership effort?
6. What is the best way to disseminate information about the project, both within project institutions as well as to external audiences?
7. What is the extent to which the CAPP Advisory Board/director/evaluator could be most helpful?
8. What other unintended outcomes have helped or hindered the CAPP projects?

A design, which included written reports by partnership projects as well as full-day evaluation workshops, was developed to seek answers to these questions. The details of this design are found in Appendix E, entitled *Plan for Evaluation Sessions*, dated March 31, 1987.

Project Reports

Each of the CAPP curriculum enhancement projects was asked to prepare a written report prior to attending the evaluation workshop session. Each of the project directors was asked to obtain information from other individuals at partner institutions regarding the specific questions listed in the section "The Design" above. The specific request is presented as Appendix F.

Each of the partnership projects did respond. These written responses served two purposes. First, the responses provided a learning set for the discussion to be held at the evaluation workshop session. Second, reports provided written data from which part of the content analysis of this report was conducted.

Project Participant Workshops

Two full-day CAPP Qualitative Evaluation Workshop sessions were held, one in northern California and one in southern California. All but one of the active partnership projects participated in the evaluation workshops. Projects were asked to identify a team of individuals to attend one of the evaluation sessions.

The team was to have at least one individual from each partner institution and was to include at least one faculty member or school teacher as well as a curriculum specialist.

To assist in gleaning information from the evaluation workshops, seven facilitators were chosen to work in small groups with the partnership individuals. These facilitators were selected from the various educational segments involved in CAPP. There were two University of California representatives, two California State University representatives, one CAL-SOAP representative, one State Department of Education representative, and one California State Community College representative. A list of facilitators is included as Appendix F. These facilitators were provided with written information regarding the evaluation design and the plan for the workshop, prior to the actual session. A one and one-half hour training session was held the morning before each evaluation session for the facilitators.

An agenda was developed for the evaluation sessions. A copy of the agenda is attached as Appendix H. The sessions were structured in the following manner. In the Opening Remarks, it was made clear that information collected during the evaluation session, as well as in the written reports, would be synthesized and only reported in an aggregate form. No specific project would be identified in the project report, nor would any individual. It was felt that this anonymity was important as it allowed partner participants to be as candid as possible.

In a plenary working session the entire group worked through the answer to one of the evaluation questions, in order to both model the way in which the interaction during the day would occur, and to get responses to the specific question. The question used at both sessions was: "What are the characteristics which enable/hinder postsecondary institutions to work effectively with schools to enhance curriculum?"

After this plenary session, the participants were divided into small groups by educational segment. That is, all of the persons from the University of California met in one group, the individuals from the California State University met in one group, etc. The priority discussion question for these "segment sessions" was: "What have you learned about effective ways of interacting with other segments in conducting a partnership project?" The purpose of this question was to determine if there were differences by segment regarding the ease or difficulty of working with the different segment partners.

After an informal lunch, the participants were convened in assigned small groups, which were both intersegmental and interproject. This division of participants was established to get interaction from different projects as well as from different segments. The facilitators were given the series of questions described above. Each facilitator received the questions in a different order so that each question would be discussed by at least one group. In actuality, the average number of questions discussed by a group was four out of eight.

After the small group discussions, a facilitator feedback panel was held to discuss some of the small group outcomes. During this discussion, participants were encouraged to add their thoughts, comments, and recommendations to the findings described by the facilitators.

Data and Analysis

Data collected

Through the above-stated activities, the following data were collected for the qualitative evaluation:

1. Written reports from each of the partnership projects.

2. Facilitator reports describing the discussions, remarks, comments, and outcomes of both the segment and intersegmental group sessions.

3. Overview comments made by the qualitative evaluator and the CAPP Director of the general workshop proceedings, as well as of the sessions which they "floated" among.

Analysis

From all of the written information, a qualitative data analysis was conducted. As described by Miles and Huberman, this effort would be considered a cross-site evaluation in that it reviewed data from a variety of different project sites. The specific tactics used in the content analysis of the written data included noting patterns and themes as well as clustering like items. The data responses were formatted underneath categories which were the same as the questions which the CAPP Advisory Board had raised.

Once common elements were ascertained from the data, they were placed into primary or secondary categories. Characteristics were determined to be "primary" if they were suggested by a significant number (usually over eight) of the projects. Characteristics which had fewer responses were considered secondary. Similar responses were grouped together in order to develop the findings presented in Chapter II, from which the recommendations in Chapter III were generated.

A draft of Chapters II and III was submitted to the facilitators, as well as to the CAPP Director, in order to ensure that the analysis was accurate and coincided with their perceptions of the information which came out of the evaluation sessions. Each of the facilitators was given the opportunity to suggest where there were gaps in the information presented or errors in terms of the interpretation of the data. The author of the report, however, takes full responsibility for the information presented herein.

Achieving Academic Excellence Through School/College Partnerships 1987-90

Qualitative evaluation
of the
curriculum enhancement projects
participating in the
California Academic Partnership Program

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) was established in 1984 by the Legislature of the state of California. The purpose of CAPP is to stimulate the state's secondary and postsecondary institutions to work cooperatively to improve the capacity of public middle and senior high schools to prepare and motivate students for postsecondary education, in particular, those students underrepresented in postsecondary education due to historical, economic, or geographic factors. Following the advice and recommendations of an intersegmental advisory committee, CAPP funds the development and ongoing work of school/college partnerships. From 1984 to 1987, twenty CAPP-funded projects were conducted; the second set of ten curriculum enhancement projects was implemented from 1987 to 1990.

To complement its quantitative evaluation of the outcomes of the CAPP efforts, the CAPP Advisory Committee determined that a qualitative evaluation, focusing on what works in the development of partnerships, should be conducted. A similar study was done in 1987, and the results proved to be beneficial in providing specific information about ways in which successful partnerships can be effected, as evidenced by the successful implementation of the second set of CAPP projects.

This qualitative evaluation utilized the focus group technique to collect data from school and college participants from each of the nine CAPP-funded projects. Their combined expertise was shared in responses to the following questions:

1. What are the best ways to realize an effective partnership between schools/school districts and postsecondary institutions?
   - What elements need to be in place to ensure effective school/college collaboration?
   - What is the best administrative structure?
   - What are the best ways to promote postsecondary faculty and schools' faculty to work together?
   - What are the best ways for postsecondary faculty to assist schools to enhance curriculum and to enhance other academic preparation efforts?
2. What are the best ways to disseminate information about the partnership project: both communications within project institutions as well as dissemination to external audiences?
3. What are the best ways to evaluate the ongoing, as well as the end result, effectiveness of these programs?
4. How are non-grant funded costs shared by the partners? What ways can partners benefit from "cost-sharing"?
5. How can partnership efforts be coordinated with other school change/reform efforts?
6. What are the best ways to institutionalize (continue) the partnership effort after initial grant funding?
7. What are the two most important pieces of advice you would give to schools and postsecondary institutions as they begin to develop partnership efforts to enhance curriculum?

8. What are the best ways to provide focused academic preparation efforts for students under-represented at four-year postsecondary institutions?

9. What are the best ways to involve school parents in these efforts?

10. What unintended outcomes have occurred as a result of the partnership/curriculum enhancement projects?

11. In what ways could the CAPP Advisory Committee/CAPP Statewide Director/CAPP Evaluators be more helpful?

The findings from the focus group discussion strongly validated the findings from the 1987 Qualitative Evaluation Report. In addition, the findings suggest ways to realize a more mature and complex partnership and provide ways to respond to more sophisticated issues regarding the development of school/college partnerships.

In general, partners found that partnerships can best succeed when these elements are in place:

- Clear, common goals and objectives developed cooperatively and offering mutual benefit for all partners;
- Mutual trust and respect among administrators and faculty from all involved partner institutions, based upon absolute honesty;
- Shared responsibility and accountability for each partner institution;
- A willingness to recognize and understand the different cycles and languages of the various educational institutions involved;
- Provision of sufficient time to develop and strengthen the relationship among and between faculty and administrators of each partner institution;
- Continual interaction between top administration, which supports and protects the efforts, and the faculty directly involved in carrying out the curriculum enhancement efforts;
- Crisp lines of communication, both formal and informal, regular and frequent;
- Involvement of high quality individuals, both in administrative and faculty roles;
- Recognition that partnerships are an evolutionary, iterative process, based upon the ability to engage in positive relationships to reach a common goal; and
- Periodic formative evaluation to ensure that the partnership activities are meeting the needs and ends desired.

The results of the sharing of expertise by the CAPP project partners provides a great deal of detail regarding successful ways to enhance ongoing partnership efforts. The recommendations suggest ways in which a variety of constituents can forward the partnership agenda, for specific projects and for the statewide administration of CAPP.

The true achievement of excellence in the education and preparation of California's students will, ultimately, result from schools and colleges working as co-equals in cooperative, mutually beneficial curriculum enhancement projects. This report suggests ways in which this coming together can best occur.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Why partnerships? Why attempt to work through the struggle of dealing with another bureaucracy, when one has a difficult enough time dealing with one's own? Why take on additional tasks, additional responsibilities, when there is already too much to do?

Why indeed. The present condition of education in the United States is making it evident to school and college educators that educational system isolation is not in the best interests of education in general or any individual educational system. Whether the system be the K-12 schools, the community colleges, or the universities, system isolation leads to a lack of effectiveness, which leads to a lack of educational excellence for the students.

The partnership projects involved in the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) are experiencing a demonstrable improvement in the education of their students, because schools and colleges were willing to collaborate, to form partnerships.

Sirotnik and Goodlad (1988) defined the purpose of school/college partnerships as the creation of "a process and an accompanying structure through which each *equal* party to a collaborative agreement will seek to draw on the complementary strengths of the other *equal* parties in advancing its self-interests. Each partnership is a means to this end and not an end in itself" (p. 26). The nine CAPP curriculum enhancement projects, which were carried out from 1987 to 1990, took risks and challenged the concept of system isolation. They worked toward *equal* partnerships to achieve a higher standard of excellence and to provide enhancement opportunities for their students. If excellence in education is to be achieved, partnerships among educators must be realized.

The California Academic Partnership Program

The California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) is part of California's Omnibus Educational Reform Act (Senate Bill 813). In 1984, Assemblywoman Teresa Hughes authored specific legislation (Assembly Bill 2398) to establish CAPP to "develop cooperative efforts to improve the academic quality of the public secondary schools with the objective of improving the preparation of all students for college." (Assembly Bill 2398 is found in Appendix A.) This program was designed to fund model projects that prepare secondary school students for college. CAPP curriculum enhancement projects involve college and university faculty working together with high school and junior high school faculty in the development of curriculum, to provide students with the skills and information they need to succeed in college.

CAPP is administered by the trustees of the California State University. A statewide director provides overall coordination for CAPP, while an intersegmental advisory committee, made up of representatives of the University of California, the California State University, California Community Colleges, schools, independent postsecondary institutions, CAL-SOAP, and the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

The Advisory Committee reassessed its efforts in 1989 and put forth the following mission statement:

> CAPP strengthens ties between schools and colleges as faculty and administrative teams study the needs of students and determine effective ways to work together to assist those students. Through this effort CAPP stimulates the college preparation of more students, including encouraging some students to aim for a college education who might not otherwise do so.

> The mission of the curriculum enhancement projects activity of CAPP is to address middle and secondary school curriculum and related collegiate access issues. This activity occurs in the context of school/college collaboration focused in schools with large enrollments of students who are typically underrepresented in baccalaureate educational programs. Its ultimate objective is to increase the educational options of such students (p. 5).

In 1984, twenty curriculum enhancement projects were funded across the state for a two and one-half year project time frame. These projects produced variable results. In its evaluation of CAPP, the California Postsecondary Education Commission noted:

> The twenty curriculum development projects have a mixed record of success in achieving their objectives, with some of the projects clearly outstanding, some effective, and some ineffective. The successful projects had a positive impact on the students in increasing postsecondary enrollments and improving preparation for baccalaureate work.
>
> CAPP has stimulated meaningful school and college partnerships involving the University of California, California State University, the California Community Colleges, and independent colleges and universities in the areas of curriculum development in teacher inservice training. Replications of these partnerships in other regions of the state would be beneficial (p. 1).

While the quantitative outcomes of the first set of CAPP curriculum enhancement projects were varied as described above, a qualitative evaluation was also carried out which led to a series of recommendations about ways in which effective partnerships could be shaped. This report, *Creating Effective Relationships with School/College Partnerships: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Curriculum Enhancement Projects Participating in the California Academic Partnership Program, 1984-1987*, suggested ways in which relationships could best be developed for effective partnerships.

A second set of funded CAPP projects began in 1987. These include eight new projects as well as two showcase projects. Showcase projects are those continuing from the first set of CAPP projects which showed effective utilization of the partnership efforts to promote student advancement. (A list of all of the projects can be found in Appendix C.) This second set of CAPP partnership projects based its efforts upon the experience of the first set of projects.

Purpose of this Report

An extensive evaluation model has been developed by the CAPP Advisory Committee. The intent of the evaluation is to ensure that there are clear and measurable data with which to assess the impact of this second set of CAPP-funded curriculum enhancement projects. Part of the mixed results reported by the California Postsecondary Education Commission were due to the fact that these types of measurable data were not available from the first set of CAPP projects. The CAPP Advisory Committee determined that a qualitative evaluation focused on gleaning from the project partners themselves what it is they found successful in the development and enhancement of their partnership activities would serve as an important adjunct to the quantitative data collected by the external evaluators. As stated above, a similar study was conducted in 1987 and utilized by the current CAPP projects as a base for the development of their partnerships. As stated in Chapter II, *Findings*, the information from the 1987 report worked well for the current set of CAPP projects. Their experiences validated the recommendations and perceptions of the first set of CAPP projects.

The purposes of this report are to:

- Supplement the CAPP summative evaluation reports that are to be based upon measurable outcomes of the intended individual project objectives as well as the overall CAPP objectives;
- Serve as a primary source of advice and guidance to new CAPP curriculum projects as well as to other partnership efforts being developed within the state and across the nation;
- Serve as a source of information regarding CAPP and its effects;
- Determine the extent to which the first set of findings from the curriculum enhancement projects was found to be effective by the second set of CAPP projects; and
- Add to the literature regarding intersegmental partnership programs.

Utilizing a focus group data collection technique, this report reflects the experiences and perceptions of actual school/college partners who have been involved in and have carried out partnerships for three to six years. Their collective wisdom regarding what went right and how they would do things differently is presented with an eye to enhancing one road to academic excellence: partnership.

Chapter II
FINDINGS

Achieving effective partnerships is not done by following one specific model, one specific check list. Rather, effective partnerships occur through a co-mingling of administrative elements and hard work. The Findings derived from the Focus Group data indicate that there are many good ways to realize effective partnerships.

Presented below are the findings from the data generated by the participants in the CAPP Curriculum Enhancement Projects for the past three years. The findings reflect the fundamental elements or characteristics of successful partnerships, and they offer ways in which partnerships can be effectively organized, suggestions about how to impact underrepresented students and their parents in partnership efforts, specific advice from current partnership members to those wishing to begin partnerships, unintended outcomes of those who participated in the CAPP program, and specific recommendations for enhancing the interworkings of the CAPP Advisory Committee and evaluators.

Reference is made to the Qualitative Evaluation of the first set of CAPP projects, conducted in 1987 (this study is hereafter referred to as the 1987 report) and the extent to which the current findings either alter, reinforce, or embellish the findings of the first effort.

Characteristics of an Effective Partnership

Partners identified ten characteristics that lead to successful school/college partnership. Nine of these characteristics were identified in the 1987 report; one of the characteristics (evolutionary change) emerged from this study. Respondents considered four of these characteristics primary. The remaining six characteristics are seen as complementary to, but not as powerful and essential as, the first four.

Those characteristics determined to be most essential to effective partnerships are:

1. A clear definition of project goals that is recognized and developed cooperatively, allowing the project to "create a vision" that will enable all participants to share a common purpose. It is important that these goals be measurable so that progress toward them can be ascertained. The goals need to reflect the extent to which each partner mutually benefits from the partnership's effort.

2. The development of mutual trust and respect among administrators and faculty of all involved partners. This development of trust helps assure partners that what they are involved in is professionally appropriate and ensures the recognition of teachers as "the experts" in curriculum reform. The keys to achieving this mutual trust are "absolute honesty" and a recognition of each other's expertise.

3. A need for shared responsibility and accountability among partner institutions. This calls for formalized operating procedures to ensure that each institution participates fully and is held accountable for its participation.

4. A willingness to recognize and understand the different cycles and languages of the various educational segments. Each partner needs to be flexible in dealing with the variety of institutional policies and processes that govern the different kinds of postsecondary institutions and schools. One partner called this "developing an operational compatibility." Only through this willingness to come together as equals are projects able to move ahead and "share each other's reality."

The remaining items were also seen as important characteristics of successful collaboration. These are:

5. The provision of sufficient time to develop and strengthen the relationship, both among faculty as well as administrators. This includes unstructured as well as structured time. Conceiving of the effort not as a "quick fix," but rather as an ongoing process, enables a breakdown of the perceived hierarchy between postsecondary and school individuals.

6. Continual interaction between top administration and the faculty directly involved in carrying out the curriculum enhancement effort is needed. However, while encouragement and support from top administration is seen as crucial, strict oversight is shown to have a negative impact.

7. Crisp lines of communication are necessary. These need to be *inclusive* of individuals within project institutions, rather than exclusive, and communication needs to be both formal and informal, regular and frequent.

8. High quality individuals, both in administrative and teaching roles, who have primary responsibility for the development of the partnership projects, must be in place. These are the heroes and champions of the partnership.

9. Partners must recognize the evolutionary process of change. In addition, the change that is to be effected by the partnership must be based upon the recognized needs of the individuals involved. Relationships are the key to successful partnerships. Often the analogy to a "marriage" is alluded to as the way partnerships should be envisioned: "If they are not getting better, they are getting worse."

10. Periodic formative evaluation must occur in order to ensure that the kinds of activities undertaken are focused on reaching the mutually developed goals.

Partners indicated that if these characteristics are in place the partnership can, in fact, be successful.

Van De Water (1989), in his extensive review of the literature on partnerships, identified ten characteristics of successful school/college collaborations. Seven of these elements are congruent with those found by the CAPP partners. They are: 1) mutual self-interest in common goals, 2) mutual trust and respect, 3) shared decision-making, 4) commitment from top leadership, 5) long-term commitment, 6) dynamic nature, and 7) information sharing. In addition, he found three characteristics not cited by the CAPP partners. It is interesting to note the reason for these differences. The three characteristics that he found, not indicated by the CAPP partners, are: 1) clear focus, 2) fiscal support, and 3) manageable agenda. The CAPP partners already had items 1 and 2, clear focus and fiscal support, as part of their proposals for funding to CAPP. The focus was created by the Request for Proposal process that CAPP implemented for a partnership to be selected, and fiscal support was available through the resources given to the project by CAPP. The third item, a manageable agenda, did not surface from the CAPP partners as one of the essential elements. However, it does appear in section "Advice to Novice Partnerships" as an item recommended by partners to those institutions considering developing their own partnerships.

Effective Administrative Structures

A question that generated a great deal of discussion and was, perhaps, one of the primary contributions of the 1987 report, dealt with determining the most appropriate administrative structure for school/college partnerships. In the current study, the author was surprised that this item generated little response. Upon examination, the reason for this lack of response seems to be the effectiveness of the findings of the 1987 report. That is, the 1987-90 CAPP projects utilized the findings from the

1987 report as a boilerplate in establishing structures for their own partnerships, fitting in their individualized institutional cultures and the goals they wanted to reach. What this suggests is that the findings from the 1987 report regarding administrative structure are strongly linked with the establishment of successful academic partnerships. However, these effective structures only worked because individual partnerships were willing to exercise the organizational principle of *equafinality*, that is, that there are many good ways to an end. Organizationally, the current partners utilized the principles of the earlier study, but appropriately matched them to their specific environments. It is this adaptation of the administrative principles that allowed these projects to succeed.

The administrative issues that were central to successful governance as noted in the 1987 report are summarized as follows:

1. A strong advisory committee that evidences the important issue of shared governance among project partners. The committee needs to be non-hierarchical, to involve all of the partner institutions, to address ways problems can be solved *collaboratively*, to meet regularly, and to urge the development of subcommittees wherein teachers play the primary role.

2. Establishment of collaboratively developed goals and objectives that recognize the importance of attaining mutual benefit from the outcomes of the effort.

3. Honest communication, both internal and external, is needed.

4. Identification of individuals with responsibility for the partnership effort at each of the partner institutions is the final essential ingredient for administrative success.

Institutions wishing to develop school/college partnerships would be well advised to look in detail at the findings and recommendations made in the 1987 report because, combined, these factors allow partnerships to work, as evidenced by the success of the 1987-90 CAPP Project Partners.

Promoting Faculty-to-Faculty Interactions

Similar to the results found in the section above, little new was added to this item from the 1987 report. Again, the results indicate the positive nature of the findings from the first set of CAPP partners.

To reiterate from the earlier report, there were four primary factors found to promote positive faculty-to-faculty interaction. These are:

1. Establish incentives that support the development of faculty-to-faculty interaction, including released school faculty time (the most important factor), stipends, provision of support for faculty to meet at each other's sites, and involvement in summer programs.

2. The ability to bring faculty together in gatherings or forums so that they will have both formal and informal interaction is the second factor. These forums need to be structured in an appropriate way so that there is sufficient time (two hours is insufficient) for faculty to develop a relationship based upon an understanding of their discipline, and, in addition, to recognize each other's environments, concerns, and challenges.

3. The ability to identify key faculty, both at the postsecondary institution as well as at the high school, who can serve as role models and leaders in establishing the partnership was also mentioned.

4. Ensuring that the activities involving faculty reinforce the concept of teachers as professionals is the final point from the 1987 report.

Two points emanating from the current study that add to these findings are:

5. The principal plays an essential role in encouraging and promoting faculty interaction. For school faculty, it is essential that the principal, as overall school curriculum leader, play the role of "praiser and supporter." Because of the way schools are structured, partnerships cannot succeed over the long term unless the principal is actively engaged in supporting and promoting the faculty-to-faculty interactions.

6. A final item noted in the current study is the importance of establishing early on with faculty the mutual needs and benefits of the effort. In the 1987 report it was noted that this was important for the overall partnership. The current study suggests the exploration of mutual benefit when school and college faculty come together.

Enhancing School Curriculum

Again, responses to the question of the best way for postsecondary faculty to help schools enhance curriculum and other academic preparation efforts reflect the effectiveness of the findings of the 1987 report. The two essential items found earlier are:

1. Curriculum enhancement efforts must be based upon the school's needs. For successful school/college partnerships to occur, postsecondary institutions need to understand and support the schools' agenda. Successful collaboration occurs when the needs of the school/school district are foremost in the development of the partnership activities. This responsiveness to needs works best when the activities envisioned match the larger view in the school reform plan. This does not take away from the earlier finding that mutual benefits, including those of the postsecondary institution, be identified. It is, however, to ensure that the focus of activities is on the ways that schools can more appropriately enhance their curriculum to better prepare their students.

2. A second characteristic found in the 1987 report that is reinforced by the current study is that there must be sufficient time for faculty to work together to enhance the curriculum, to discuss their discipline, to determine the way they will work together, and to understand each other's environment.

The current study expands upon the earlier findings by clarifying the roles that postsecondary and school faculty can best play.

Postsecondary faculty expertise was found to be most helpful when it was focused upon: the ability to garner extramural support through grants or through other sources; the ability to relate, from their academic discipline perspective, what it is that students need in order to succeed in postsecondary education; and the ability to bring to the dialogue those cutting-edge issues that can enhance the curriculum through recent research findings about the discipline.

School faculty can bring to the discussion the following: the ability to inform postsecondary faculty of the complexities facing schools and students in meeting state, district, and schoolwide requirements; information about change and curriculum reform efforts occurring within the school sector (in California this relates to such activities as the development of the discipline frameworks, the focus of competency statements, the utilization of diagnostic testing and statewide testing results, etc.). Furthermore, school

faculty can serve as experts on the ways teachers can positively engage the culturally diverse classrooms they deal with daily, in that they have experience with these classrooms prior to postsecondary faculty having these experiences.

Another item identified through the current study is the importance of hosting events for postsecondary and school faculty on the school site. These events can have many formats such as seminars, forums or retreats, but they should all allow an opportunity for school and college faculty to meet in small groups by discipline. It was heretofore believed that hosting such activities at postsecondary institutions lent to the professionalization of the teaching faculty. While this is found to be somewhat accurate, it is equally true that hosting events at the school site reinforces the idea of teacher as expert and provides an opportunity for postsecondary faculty to interact with their future clients, the students. Partners urged that the theme of "student success" permeate the faculty-to-faculty discussions, as a way to focus on appropriate curriculum change.

The current lack of education and instruction provided to new school teachers about school/college partnerships was also identified by the current partners. There is little, if any, discussion in teacher training programs about the ways partnerships with postsecondary faculty can occur. This oversight needs to be rectified in teacher education programs in order to take advantage of the eagerness and creativity of new school faculty as they begin their teaching careers. More importantly, schools must recognize that new teachers need to learn how their efforts can be enhanced through their interaction with postsecondary faculty when this interaction is occurring at the school site. One suggestion is for master teachers to model for new teachers ways in which these collaborations can best occur.

Communicating Effectively

The critical importance of communication to the success of school/college collaboration was noted in the 1987 report. That importance was strongly reiterated in the current study. Open and honest dealings among partners is essential to develop the trust necessary for successful relationships. This finding is often indicated by those studying school/college partnerships. While the nature of the communication between postsecondary faculty and administrators and their school counterparts is noted above in characteristics for effective partnerships, this study explores ways that communication can be utilized to enhance partnerships. A question similar to the one raised three years ago was asked: "What is the best way to disseminate information about the partnership project within project institutions, as well as dissemination to external audiences?" The responses to this question, once again, reinforced the findings of the 1987 report, and, in addition, added new thoughts to important ways this can occur.

Internal Communication

The two primary ways of sharing information cited in the 1987 report were again found to be the most important internal ways to share information by the current CAPP partners. The foremost way is "word of mouth." Perceptions related to the project's success, or lack of success, shared directly by those within the project is the most powerful form of communication. This is not unusual among individuals within organizations. A new wrinkle added by the findings of this study was the partners' discovery that "word of mouth" communication could, to a certain extent, be structured. Partners found that deliberate identification of the important networks of individuals to inform about the success or activities of the project, at all levels within the institutions, was important. This sense of structured informal communication has worked in keeping the important constituents, who must know about what is occurring within the partnership, well informed.

The second way projects informed local constituents about the project was through some sort of newsletter. This was also found to be one of the most effective means of communication in the 1987 report.

New ideas expressed by the current study include: utilization of new technology, such as "E-Mail" and computer bulletin boards for sharing information; the importance of ensuring that events, goals, and outcomes of the activities are communicated in some ongoing way. It was suggested that the outcomes of this evaluation report can be utilized as information pieces in partnership communications. The sharing of other literature regarding successful partnerships was also found to be useful.

Respondents indicated other ways to encourage internal communication. One group that is seen as especially important to include in the communications flow is the school board. Regular, formal presentations to the school board about the progress of the partnership, as well as informal meetings between school board members and the partners from postsecondary institutions and, perhaps, CAPP Advisory Committee members were found to be helpful. In addition, it was seen as essential that internal minutes of Partnership Advisory Committee meetings, and any written outcomes from faculty-to-faculty meetings, be shared broadly. All of these techniques lend to the developing of a positive perception at the institution about the success and importance of the partnership effort.

External Communications

Study respondents indicated that, while external communications are important to the project, it is doubly important to ensure that these are carefully targeted. Partners noted that resources are scarce and that utilization of them for external communication, while useful, needs to be considered in light of budget constraints.

Respondents in the present study and in the 1987 report found two forms of external communication to be most effective. In the 1987 report, joint presentations at conferences by postsecondary faculty with school faculty was given as the most effective method by the earlier participants. They found that articles and stories about the partnerships presented in the news media were somewhat less effective. However, current participants cited the latter as more effective than the former.

In addition, current respondents urged that the Focus Group technique, similar to that used to gather data for this study, be employed to share knowledge among and across partnership projects to recognize what other projects are doing regarding similar concerns and issues. At the same time the technique allows participants to learn from the experience and from the combined thinking of others because of the dialogue nature of the group process.

Project participants also indicated that inviting outside visitors on site to learn about the partnership serves two important functions. It allows those interested in developing partnerships an opportunity to see the partnership in action, and it serves as a catalyst for the partners "to get their act together" in relation to talking about and thinking about what it is they are attempting to achieve.

Utilization of Evaluation

When the 1987 report was conducted, no items of significance arose regarding the impact of evaluation, either formative or summative, on the effectiveness of partnerships. A possible explanation for this finding is the proscriptive evaluation required by CAPP of each project. The CAPP evaluation model includes collecting common data from all projects to determine progress toward overall CAPP goals as well as gathering data to determine the extent to which individual project goals and objectives are met. While there was a general sense that formative evaluation is a necessary component of an effective partnership, there was little practical utilization of formative evaluation, or of summative evaluation, by the projects. When, three years later, a new set of project partners was asked about evaluation, different results occurred.

While evaluation remains a difficult task for most projects, specific recommendations on the best ways to utilize evaluation were forthcoming. The hardest problem projects faced was evaluating only the effects of the CAPP partnership efforts. This is true because there are so many school reform efforts underway at school sites besides the partnership efforts. Trying to single out the effects of one intervention among many is awkward. Nonetheless, projects did find important aspects of both kinds of evaluation for successful partnerships.

Formative Evaluation

Formative evaluation is an ongoing assessment of the effectiveness of a project while it is being carried out. Projects noted two specific elements that need to be in place for effective formative evaluation.

1. The most essential element is well-defined goals and objectives by project partners in order to set reasonable expectations and outcomes. A variety of measures was suggested as having the capability to determine the success of the outcomes, including: assessment tools, numbers of students succeeding in college preparatory courses, acceptance rates at postsecondary institutions, types of institutions students attend, measures of student self-esteem, and retention of students both at schools and postsecondary institutions.

   It is the clear consensus of project partners that the ability to set clear goals and objectives in the initial stages of the partnership is crucial to keep the partnership focused and on track.

2. The second element of formative evaluation strongly recommended by the partners is the inclusion of both "hard and soft" data in the formative assessment. The limitations of hard data, such as number of students reaching certain goals, test scores, and other measurable items, is apparent, and the need for soft data, i.e., qualitative information, was pointed out. Project partners found that an evaluation grid, indicating by objective the specific data both hard and soft that needs to be collected as well as a time line upon which these data can be reviewed, is an effective way to utilize evaluation as a management tool. Projects using such a grid indicate continuing focus of their efforts and an ability to be flexible in altering project goals and objectives as situations warrant.

Summative Evaluation

One aspect of evaluation considered essential by almost all the project partners is the ability to gather longitudinal data on the success of students. Until this can be well institutionalized among partners whose students go from school to postsecondary institutions, the real effect of partnership efforts will be unknown. Some projects have put into effect longitudinal studies, and simply knowing that such outcomes will be assessed has an additional outcome of serving as a catalyst to support the ongoing partnership efforts.

Project partners point out a lack of evaluation training among individuals engaged in these efforts. It is suggested that project partners spend some time together in training sessions on evaluation techniques. General evaluation orientation workshops could be provided by the CAPP office. This kind of "up front" time could be extremely useful for the ongoing determination of the effectiveness of the projects.

Effectively Sharing Costs

An item added to the current study for the CAPP projects is the question, "How are non-grant funded costs shared by the partners? In what ways can partners benefit from cost-sharing?" While CAPP projects received three years of funding to support their collaborative efforts, as it is well known, there is never enough money to carry out the variety of activities proposed as well as to take advantage of creativity

and enhancements along the way. In general, partners indicate that cost-sharing benefits them in a variety of ways, including: the ability to expand and enhance programs, the ability to utilize resources from more than one institution to complete a common goal, and the organizational outcome that cost-sharing made the partnership more concrete.

Those items that partners suggested as ways to enhance cost-sharing are:

1. Ensure that each partner institution contributes *something*. It is important that each partner contribute some kind of support and that this contribution be recognized. The contribution could be discretionary dollars or in-kind contributions. Whatever the contribution, the importance of recognizing partners' cost-sharing is a necessary component of successful partnership.

2. Partners found that the most successful way to cost-share is to combine resources with other funded efforts. It was seen that CAPP resources could be integrated with other like-project efforts to get the maximum use out of the partnership approach. This co-mingling of dollars was described by one project in the following way: "If you had to break out every little piece (of funded effort) the whole effort couldn't work." This internal brokering of project resources is an important lesson in the way projects can maximize scarce resources.

3. Projects found that, unlike the current CAPP three-year funding cycle (for 1990-93 CAPP projects it is a four-year cycle), five years of some solid support is essential. This finding is congruent with other partnership studies which suggest five years as a normal time for partnerships to develop and be institutionalized.

Coordination of Partnerships with Other Change/Reform Efforts

1. When the California Academic Partnership Program began in 1984, it was on the "leading edge" of school reform efforts in the state of California. The Omnibus Educational Reform Act of 1983 had just been enacted, and activities and efforts related to it were new and had only just begun to be initiated. When research for the 1987 Report was conducted, there was relatively little interaction between the CAPP projects and other school reform efforts. This has changed dramatically for the current set of CAPP project partners. Four items emerged from the data when partners were asked the question: "How can partnership efforts be coordinated with other school change/reform efforts?"

   Most project partners indicated that it is important to deliberately define the "common threads" of the different reform efforts within the school and to bring those together to encourage the school/school district in moving toward an aggressive reform agenda. Some partners noted that they had, in fact, set this as one of their goals. Integration of programmatic efforts was seen as essential to get work done in a most efficient way. Without this, organizational separatism occurred because of a failure to integrate resources and to identify key personnel.

2. Projects found it especially effective to build efforts around ongoing school activities. For example, each district is involved in a statewide common curriculum review cycle. If the curriculum area of the review can be coordinated with the partnership effort, continuity and integration with ongoing reform activities can be coalesced.

3. The utilization of external resources to assist in the development of the partnership is seen as an important component to ensure congruence with other reform efforts. In California the three most often cited projects for partners to collaborate with were the California Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Program, the California Writing Project, and the California Mathematics Project.

Ensuring Institutionalization

The concept of institutionalization, i.e., the ability of a project to continue after grant funds have been discontinued, is a theme which occurs in Chapter II, sections "Effectively Sharing Costs" and "Coordination of Partnerships with Other Change/Reform Efforts." The current CAPP projects indicated much more awareness and willingness to engage in the institutionalization of their projects than did the first set of CAPP partners. In the 1987 report, only one item, integrating school/college activities into the ongoing nature of the school environment, was indicated. While this again is indicated by the current projects, more specific findings are offered. Two of the findings are reflected in the ability to have an ongoing sharing of costs and commitment of resources and integration with other change efforts as the ongoing structure upon which to build the school/college partnerships.

Below are listed new items found by the CAPP partners when responding to the question, "What are the best ways to institutionalize (continue) the partnership effort after initial grant funding?"

1. Current CAPP partners were much more discriminating about the kinds of activities that should be integrated into the ongoing school/college partnership processes than the first set of partners. It is pointed out that not all of the ongoing partnership efforts should continue after initial funding. Determining and selecting the important elements of the collaboration are seen as an important process for partners to engage in while the partnership is underway, not simply something to be done as they reach the end of grant funding. Establishing firm priorities and setting new goals is a way to move toward institutionalization of the partnership efforts.

2. Partners suggested the continuation of project advisory committees. Over three years, persons on these committees have learned to trust and respect each other, and simply making a commitment for them to continue to meet helps to ensure that ongoing collaboration will occur.

3. Partners suggested ways to engage businesses as third partners in the collaboration. These expanded partnership efforts were mentioned but unknown in practical matters by the first set of partners. By identifying and engaging business and corporate partners in the ongoing school reform efforts, continuation of the partnership's efforts is more likely assured. It was also pointed out that the infrastructure developed by the school/college partnership fits well with the way in which businesses can identify with successful activities.

4. The ability to have effective public relations throughout the project is seen as an important component for eventual institutionalization. If school boards and postsecondary institutions are made aware of good relations and outcomes because of their ability to work together for their common goals, it is perceived that institutionalization has a better chance of occurring.

5. Projects also suggest finding ways to market materials developed through the partnership, specifically curriculum enhancement materials. Developing and "selling" of enhancement packages is seen as a way to support the continuation of the projects.

6. Projects also found that utilizing the postsecondary institutions development offices is helpful. The resources available through these offices such as identification of extramural sources and assistance in proposal development generally are unknown in school/school districts and yet are well known in postsecondary institutions. Projects report good success in establishing relationships with development offices so that funding for partnerships can be a priority as grant funding ceases.

Advice to Novice Partnerships

To get a sense of the relative importance of the above findings about effective partnerships, one of the Focus Group questions was designed to glean from the respondents those items they was as *most important* regarding the *establishment* of partnerships. The question was phrased, "What are the two most important pieces of advice you would give to schools and postsecondary institutions as they begin to develop partnership efforts to enhance curriculum?" This question was discussed by each of the Focus Groups, and in each group it engendered lively discussion. While the items indicated below are somewhat repetitive of items indicated in "Effective Administrative Structures" through "Ensuring Institutionalization" above, the intent is to help determine the degree of importance of these items to beginning partnerships.

Items listed below are in descending order of frequency cited by the respondents. One particularly strong item was stated by a majority of the respondents; two other items were indicated by at least half of the respondents; three items were mentioned frequently but by less than half of the respondents, and an additional six items were noted. All of these are listed below so that new projects can get a sense of what veterans see as important characteristics to have in place for successful partnerships.

1. The most frequently cited item (two-thirds of the respondents indicated this as one of their two pieces of advice) was for the partnership to have clear direction. By this is meant the establishment of goals and objectives that meet the test of mutual benefit for both schools and postsecondary institutions. Additionally, assumptions about the ways and means of reaching project goals must be explicitly stated during the development stage. It is clear from this finding that it is essential to have a clear vision of where the partnership is supposed to go before it begins to get there.

2. Half of the respondents indicated two other items they advised new partnerships to have in place.

   — The first of these is to ensure that the partnership is focusing on the school's needs. That, while it is important to recognize mutual benefits, it is inappropriate for postsecondary institutions to "place their agenda" onto the school site environment. Rather, the postsecondary institution must work with the school to meet its curriculum enhancement needs.

   An essential aspect of focusing on school needs is to indicate the extent to which students will be better served. It is clear from the data that students emerge as the "common link" between the partner institutions. The ability to discuss the school's needs in relation to enhancing students' academic preparation is a key component in successful partnerships. Along these same lines, it is urged that the partnership needs be part of the school plan and that teachers be empowered as "experts" in carrying out curriculum reform.

   — The second item, indicated by half of the respondents, is to begin the partnership with an effort of manageable size that is, however, part of a broader vision. In other words, partners urged new partnerships to begin in a modest way in terms of activities, but to have the broadest scope of vision for their activities so that projects can be flexible in meeting needs and new situations as they emerge. Partners suggested that this approach will have the greatest benefit in terms of realizing positive outcomes.

3. There are three other items which were mentioned by a number (but less than half) of respondents. These are:

   — Ensure that partnerships are recognized as dynamic relationships. Partnerships need structure and the willingness of individuals to work positively toward a relationship that can enhance

the outcomes of their efforts. These partnerships are iterative and evolutionary, not revolutionary. They must evidence a capacity for trust as well for experimentation, and those individuals involved as the key persons for the partnership must have good interpersonal skills and find healthy ways to "fight" and resolve conflict among themselves.

- Another element important to the development of successful partnerships is time. The time envisioned is of two kinds. The first is planning time sufficient to allow the partners to feel that they "own" the efforts. The experience of the current project partners is that it took almost a full year to get faculty actually involved in the project because faculty did not participate in the initial planning phases. (It is important to note that the CAPP Advisory Committee recognized this need in planning for the 1990-93 curriculum enhancement projects and provided one-year planning grants during 1989-90 so that this time was available and involvement could occur.) The other type of time needed is informal time early on in the project to develop collegial relationships. The importance of this kind of time cannot be understated.

- The third element indicated by a number of respondents is the importance of "support from the top." This is suggested as a combination of a strong endorsement of persons from each partner institution "with title" who can provide budgetary as well as institutional support. While the involvement of these individuals needs to be visible, it does not need to be pervasive. The "top" individuals need to serve as buffers during the early going of the project with other institutional demands. The final characteristic of this "top" support is that it should not dictate what occurs but allows "the faculty experts" to engage in a variety of ways to meet curriculum enhancement needs.

4. There were five other items indicated by the project partners; these are:

   - the importance of including a community college in the partnership to help ensure that the needs of all graduating secondary school students can be served;

   - the importance of open and honest communication;

   - the recognition of the contributions of the individuals involved in the partnership;

   - the importance of discussing the budget regularly and of ensuring that a team of budget persons, one from each partner institution, exists; and

   - the importance of visiting a "working" partnership.

Academic Preparation for Underrepresented Students

One of the primary emphases of the 1984 CAPP legislation is to provide academic preparation for students underrepresented in postsecondary education. CAPP projects are chosen for funding on the basis of their location within areas that serve a high percentage of underrepresented students in their population. Three groups of students are categorized as underrepresented: groups historically underrepresented in postsecondary education (Hispanic, black, Native American), students from low-income families, and students from California geographic areas that have a low participation rate in postsecondary education.

In the 1987 report partners discussed ways to target and serve underrepresented students in general terms. The items emerging from that study were: specialized tutoring, involvement of parents, and

provision of summer programs. As stated below, specialized tutoring and summer programs also emerged from the current group of project partners. Comments about parent involvement have been separated out in this study and can be found in the section "Ways to Involve Parents Successfully." It is apparent from the comments listed below that much more attention was paid to involving and serving underrepresented students by the second set of CAPP projects than by the first. This finding, and the findings noted earlier regarding the adequacy of the organizational structures perceived by the current project partners, indicate that the first set of projects spent much more time attempting to organize how they would work. The second set of projects, utilizing what had been learned earlier about effective partnership organizations, worked to a higher degree of complexity and involvement with such issues as service to underrepresented students and their parents.

Two items emerged as most pervasive in meeting the needs of underrepresented students. In addition, three other items were mentioned by participants. The first item was suggested by over two-thirds of the respondents, while the second item was indicated by approximately half of the respondents. The first finding is expansive and takes into account a great deal about the way in which underrepresented students can be served.

1. The most important aspect of serving underrepresented students is that the partnership activities need to be of benefit to the *whole school population*. That is, they are to be "inclusive — not exclusive." It is strongly reiterated that all students need to be benefited by the activities; however, this does not mean that special emphasis and complementary activities should not be focused on underrepresented students.

   Projects defined a multiple strategy approach to provide services to underrepresented students, again in the context of service to all students. It is felt that the curriculum enhancement efforts in general should serve all students, while support activities are appropriately focused on students underrepresented in postsecondary education. Underrepresented students can be served most effectively in what is defined as "enrichment activities" and "academic support activities." Enrichment activities include field trips, mentors (both students from postsecondary institutions as well as faculty or administrators within the schools), and a special emphasis on student clubs. Academic support services, most importantly tutors, but in addition, academic advising and special summer help, are also indicated by a number of participants. An important component of these "special services" is to reward teachers who become involved in providing these services.

2. The second element (strongly indicated by project partners) was the abolishment of "tracking" throughout the schools, including at the elementary school levels. Project partners seem well aware of the debilitating role that academic tracking can have in the development of self-esteem and expectations and the consequent lack of academic achievement for underrepresented students. Projects specifically talked about how postsecondary faculty can work with school faculty to break down tracking and to establish ways students can learn from each other in academically heterogeneous groups. An important part of breaking down "tracking" is having "honors" teachers also teach basic skills. Abolishing institutionalized, negative expectations of students as they move through the system was strongly urged. Partners stressed the importance of carrying out these efforts at the school site with the local environment taken into account.

3. There are three other items that partners indicate would assist in the development of a focus on the success of underrepresented students. These are:

   — staff development for school faculty regarding interactions in multi-cultural classrooms; it was suggested that teachers who successfully carry this out share their expertise with both school and postsecondary faculty;

— the importance of building in activities that recognize the multi-cultural nature of classrooms and focus on enabling students to learn each other's cultures and to support each other as individuals; and

— the need to begin the above activities earlier; the third grade was most often mentioned as a starting point to begin the break down of stereotypes and the cycle of failure that under-represented students become caught up in.

Ways to Involve Parents Successfully

In the 1987 report, the issue of parental involvement was only briefly touched upon. It was suggested by project partners as an important element for involving underrepresented students. In the present study, a separate question was asked regarding ways to involve parents: "What are the best ways to involve parents in these efforts?" Again, this study's responses evidence the increased level and depth of thinking about ways in which parents can be involved in support of academic participation of their children, as compared to the thinking of the first set of partnership projects. In fact, this set of respondents pointed out the importance of broadening the idea of "parent involvement" to "family involvement." This concept underscores the need to engage the extended family in the academic motivation support network of students. The items listed below can stand by themselves as ways to involve parents and families in school efforts in general, as well as partnerships in particular. The first six items were indicated by at least half of the members as important ways to involve parents, with the first two being recommended most strongly by each project.

1. The first item suggested by each project is the importance of consistent communication to parents about the successes of their students. It was noted that parents receive primarily negative feedback from the schools regarding the performance of their children. Turning this around and providing positive information about their children and their children's ability to succeed is seen as a critical element in getting parents involved in helping their children to succeed. Partners noted that a ratio of four positive comments to each negative comment could be used as a guide that would help assure parents of the potential positive impact of schooling for their children. Partners recognized that "Kids don't want the parents to know what is going on." Therefore, it becomes incumbent upon the school to find ways that communication can be gotten to parents to promote their involvement. Ongoing follow-up, telephone calls, and materials in appropriate languages are essential ingredients of developing an element of trust with the parents. As one partner put it, "Just as in partnerships between school and colleges, trust is an essential element, so it is with school/college partners and parents."

2. The way most projects found to engage parents in the dialogue about their children is to provide social events as the initial step to "break the ice." Having food at these events was seen as necessary. Projects suggested the creation of ceremonial occasions when student accomplishments could be highlighted. For example, students' induction into special programs, recognition of student achievement, even recognition of student participation are seen as ways in which parents could be brought to the school. It is suggested that these occasions could involve door prizes related to academic preparation and motivation to attend college. It was also strongly urged that meetings with parents address real problems regarding their children's progress. The issues discussed should not be theoretical but specific, such as the use of drugs, dealing with gang activity, the impact of dropping out, and other issues that relate specifically to the real climate of the individual school. In addition, parents should be taught ways in which they can proactively engage the teachers in dialogue about the academic growth and success of their children.

3. The third item most often recommended by project partners is the development of a group of "leader-parents." These parents can serve as consultants to the broader group of parents. The

integration of such parents into the school/college partnership advisory boards, subcommittees, and other schoolwide task forces is seen as a way to ensure that parents become and stay involved.

4. Partners recommended an excellent model, the utilization of the Family Math effort, which was used by two of the projects and known by others. This effort, which engages students and parents in learning about mathematics and the importance of mathematics in students' future, has been very successful in encouraging the involvement of parents. Provision of child care and transportation are seen as essential to ensuring parents' participation in efforts of this kind.

5. An idea that emerged prominently is the involvement of "college clubs" on the school campus. College clubs can take a variety of shapes; they can be postsecondary institution specific, or they can be for students who are motivated, in general, to participate in college. While these clubs meet, discuss, and engage in campus visits, etc., the students become more aware of the impact of college on their lives. The involvement of parents in these college clubs is seen as an important component.

6. Establishing parent/family involvement as a specific priority/objective of the partnership is another important step in ensuring the success of parent activities. This relates to the establishment of goals and objectives very early on in the project and the development of the vision of what the project will accomplish. Clearly stating up front the need to involve parents helps ensure that this will occur.

The above items are those mentioned most frequently by project partners as ways to involve parents successfully. Other recommendations are:

— plan activities so that students do the presenting to parents; it was noted that parents will attend events to see their children "perform";

— build the parent partnership upon other activities that parents are involved in at the school. For example, parents involved in migrant education activities or events related to the school, could be spun off to support the parents' involvement in the academic preparation of their children;

— students should receive incentives for promoting their own parents' involvement with the partnership efforts;

— families should be provided free tickets and, to the extent possible, transportation, for events at postsecondary institutions;

— Parent Effectiveness Training (PET) should be used as a model upon which parent involvement can be based. It was also suggested that this training be linked with current volunteer/community service efforts carried out by appropriate clubs within the community;

— the need for new teachers to learn about ways in which to engage parents in the learning process is seen as something not touched upon in teacher education programs. Related to this, it is suggested that new teachers arriving at a district that has strong parent programs need to learn how parents can be engaged in the learning process.

Unanticipated Outcomes

One of the questions asked of project partners on their annual CAPP report requires a discussion of the unanticipated outcomes incurred as a result of the school/college partnership efforts. This question

was raised during the present study so that projects would have an opportunity to discuss outcomes among themselves to determine if there were common unanticipated outcomes. It is significant that the unintended outcome noted by a majority of the projects, in the current study, is the same as the unanticipated outcome indicated most often in the 1987 report. That outcome is the extent to which postsecondary faculty became aware of and appreciated the challenges to school faculty in the academic preparation of the students. In addition, another seven items were indicated by project partners as common unanticipated outcomes. Reporting these outcomes provides a sense of the richness of the experiences which school/college partnerships entail. These unanticipated outcomes are:

1. The realization by postsecondary faculty of the extent to which school faculty are truly committed to enhancing the educational preparation of their students and the complexity of the environment within which school faculty work. A true appreciation of school faculty and students emerges from the project in the minds of the postsecondary faculty.

2. A majority of the projects reported the establishment of student clubs. Clubs were unintended, yet they served to reinforce the motivation toward college preparation. Clubs had names like "Partners in Power" and "Partners in Control." These names reflect a sense of student empowerment as they take charge of their academic preparation. The reaction of students to this activity was an extremely positive one.

3. Partners reported that activities targeted for certain groups of students became institutionalized throughout the school. This includes the use of tutors, academic preparation courses (algebra was specifically noted), and a broader involvement of faculty. The ability to expand college partnership activities throughout the institution is noted as an extremely positive unintended outcome.

4. Partners noted a revitalization of school faculty. The school/college partnerships serve as a catalyst for the flow of the creative juices of school faculty.

5. The skills learned about collaborating between schools and colleges were utilized in other arenas, such as with parents, corporations, etc. The basic partnership skills are transportable to other constituents.

6. Partners reported the connection with other improvement methods and efforts as an unintended outcome. While this item was reported earlier as a way to take advantage of different school reform efforts, it was initially not envisioned as part of the partnership process by many projects. The ability to broker resources, using the school/college partnership as a base, was seen as a positive outcome from the partnership effort.

7. Partners share physical resources, including buildings and equipment. Additionally, school partners, in a few cases, had first call on surplus equipment from the postsecondary institutions.

In addition to the items noted above by a majority of the partners, these items were also mentioned.

— One postsecondary institution that began its partnership with one community college, restructured its efforts to work with all its feeder community colleges;

— One partner noted that the school/college partnership led to partners working together on common research projects and, in addition, published papers together;

— One project noted that the effort encouraged school faculty to seek advanced degrees; and

— One project noted how the partnership stimulated the development of extramural support (specifically grant writing) activities within the school.

Specific Recommendations to CAPP

Project partners were asked the question, "In what ways could the CAPP Advisory Committee/CAPP Statewide Director/CAPP Evaluators be more helpful?" The question was meant to assist the CAPP administration in enhancing its services to the project partners in the future. It is interesting to note that none of the projects had recommendations for the director. This suggests that the role currently carried out by the director is an appropriate and effective one.

There were, however, recommendations made to the CAPP Advisory Committee as well as to the CAPP Evaluators. The comments regarding evaluation were not addressed simply to the external evaluators contracted with by the CAPP Advisory Committee, but are more broadly intended to counsel the Advisory Committee as well.

Recommendations to the CAPP Advisory Committee

The Advisory Committee is a legislated intersegmental body charged with overseeing and advocating for CAPP activities. Project partners made the following recommendations to enhance the role of the Advisory Committee. The first two items were indicated most strongly by the project partners.

Partners strongly suggest that the Focus Group strategy utilized to collect data for this report be repeated for project partners on an annual basis. Not only is it a useful way to glean information for the Advisory Committee on ways in which to enhance partnerships, but project members learned from each other in a concentrated and systematic way.

Partners also recommended that the committee continue to clarify its role with project partners. They acknowledged that the newly released brochure about the Advisory Committee and the earlier released mission statement assist this effort. However, project partners suggested Advisory Committee members spend more informal time with project partners.

In addition, three other items are mentioned. They were:

— that the Advisory Committee members continue to carry out yearly site visits, which are deemed extremely useful;

— that during the site visits to the projects, Advisory Committee members meet with top administrators and school board members to reinforce the importance of the partnership efforts; and

— that acceptable utilization of CAPP resources be made clear to the projects as they begin. For example, is there a generally accepted ratio between personnel costs and operating expenses, and to what extent can resources be spent on computers?

CAPP Evaluation

While the item requested comments specifically about CAPP evaluators, it was interpreted more broadly by respondents, and, in fact, CAPP evaluation as a whole was discussed. Two items were strongly

recommended by a number of CAPP partners, and an additional two items were also suggested. Those items most often mentioned are:

1. The evaluation model utilized for CAPP projects must be made explicit. CAPP projects need to understand how the data they are collecting can be utilized to help the project, as well as how the data assist CAPP as a whole. Projects wish to know the answers to such questions as:

   — What is the conceptual framework for the evaluation?

   — Where are the data sent?

   — How are the data utilized?

   — How are the data collated?

   — Overall, why are the data needed?

   It was also recommended that the evaluators put together suggestions for ways that project partners can use the data they are collecting to enhance their own projects.

2. Project partners strongly recommended that CAPP undertake a longitudinal study on the impact of CAPP on students over time to determine the extent to which students involved in CAPP efforts succeed in postsecondary education and afterward.

Also these two items were suggested:

— that data collection be simplified, perhaps through the development of software for common reporting by each CAPP project; and

— the addition of case studies of CAPP projects be considered.

Chapter III
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the findings detailed in Chapter II, a series of recommendations can be made regarding the way in which effective partnerships can occur.

Elements of an Effective Partnership

It is recommended that in order to promote effective partnerships, the following elements be in place:

- clear, common goals and objectives developed cooperatively and offering mutual benefit for all partners;
- mutual trust and respect among administrators and faculty from all involved partner institutions, based upon absolute honesty;
- shared responsibility and accountability for each partner institution;
- a willingness to recognize and understand the different cycles and languages of the various educational institutions involved;
- provision of sufficient time to develop and strengthen the relationship among and between faculty and administrators of each partnership institution;
- continual interaction between top administration, which supports and protects the efforts, and the faculty directly involved in carrying out the curriculum enhancement efforts;
- crisp lines of communication, both formal and informal, regular and frequent;
- involvement of high quality individuals, both in administrative and faculty roles;
- recognition that partnerships are an evolutionary, iterative process, based upon the ability to engage in positive relationships to reach a common goal; and
- periodic formative evaluation to ensure that the partnership activities are meeting the needs and ends desired.

Administrative Structure

Two recommendations arise from the findings of the present study regarding the appropriate administrative structure for partnerships. The first recommendation is that the 1987 CAPP Qualitative Evaluation Study continue to be utilized as a "boilerplate" for the establishment of effective partnerships. Projects indicated that the structure defined in that document served the partnerships well in their ability to develop successful collaborations. The second recommendation is that training in organizational change theory and processes be part of the early developmental stages of the partnership. Common change occurrences, well known within the field of the change theory literature, occur during the development of partnerships. Partners schooled in these phenomena will be better able to recognize and to take advantage of the ebbs and flows of the partnership growth.

Faculty-to-Faculty Interaction

Similarly, it is recommended that the 1987 report be utilized as the "boilerplate" for ways that faculty can interact with each other. A second recommendation is that the principal be much more involved in the partnership as the curriculum leader of the institution, serving as "supporter and reinforcer" and reaffirming the role of teachers as curriculum experts.

Facilitating Curriculum Enhancement

Once again the recommendations of the 1987 report stood the test of time and were supported by the current project partners as useful ways to help ensure curriculum enhancement. Additional suggestions for assisting the school and college faculty in clarifying their roles in curriculum enhancement are found in the section "Enhancing School Currriculum." In addition, three further recommendations emerged.

First, it is recommended that the theme of "success for students" underlies the discussions that occur between postsecondary and school faculty. This theme allows faculty to focus their efforts on mutually beneficial outcomes. A second recommendation is that schools of education be involved in curriculum enhancement efforts by including partnership development training in their teacher education programs. Third, it is recommended that the school district provides staff development for new teachers, including ways in which successful school/college partnerships occur within the district.

Communications

Two levels of communication were discussed in the findings, internal and external. Recommendations emerged regarding each of these.

Internal Communication

It is recommended that a matrix be developed that will ensure the utilization of communication techniques (word-of-mouth, newsletters, etc.) deemed most appropriate for informing the community, including parents, students, and others, about the partnership. This communication matrix is a most important component to ensure that effective internal communication occurs.

A second recommendation is to utilize, to the extent possible, new communication technologies, including "E-mail, electronic bulletin boards, etc." A third recommendation is to ensure that the school board is well informed of the school/college partnership efforts. Informal as well as formal time spent discussing the efforts underway and their consequences should occur.

External Communication

The first recommendation is that external audiences for project communications be carefully selected. While external communication is appropriate, it was seen as a tremendous drain on resources. Partnerships should select carefully those in external communities who must receive project information.

The utilization of conferences to present outcomes of the partnership not only communicates information about the project, but also serves as a catalyst to promote the school/college partnership between the projects' postsecondary and school faculty. Examples of appropriate conferences are: the American Educational Research Association Conference, the California League of Middle Schools Conference, the California Principals Conference, and the State Department of Education's Annual Staff Development Conference.

The third way to share information in a facile manner is to invite visitors to observe the partnership. Once again, this activity serves as a catalyst for promoting the partnership agenda, in that it brings the partners together to think about ways the partnership is succeeding and what they wish to share with others.

It is also recommended that the Focus Group approach be utilized to share information among school/college partnerships. This is seen as especially effective, in that not only is information shared, but new outcomes and plans can emerge from the interchange of partners.

Effective Evaluation

There are four recommendations regarding how evaluation can be most effectively utilized for school/college partnerships.

The first recommendation is that, in the development of goals and objectives mutually by participants, some significant subset of these be measurable. Establishing these on the front end of the partnership effort bodes well for the eventual success of the partnership.

It is recommended that partnerships think through the utilization of both hard quantitative data as well as soft qualitative data, using an evaluation grid detailing the kinds of data to be collected and the utilization of those data. Time lines for the collection and reporting back of data is also seen as an important component to keep evaluation and focus of the project on track.

Partners are urged to consider ways in which longitudinal follow-up of the impact of their efforts on students can occur. This often gives the postsecondary institutions an opportunity to buy into the evaluation efforts.

It is recommended that training be provided to those persons involved in the project who will serve as evaluators. Training on elementary evaluation techniques goes a long way toward partners' owning the evaluation and utilizing it for effective management of the partnership.

Sharing Costs

It is recommended that each partner institution contribute *something* to the partnership. This contribution can be either discretionary funds or in-kind contributions. However, a contribution must be made, and the institution must be recognized for its willingness to contribute to the effort.

A second recommendation is that resources from similar or related projects be intertwined with partnership resources. The partnership can serve as the brokering mechanism to manage funds developed for a variety of purposes. The partnership should not be seen as a funded entity unto itself and separate from other change activities within the school.

It is recommended that planning for the partnership include, five years of some kind of funding for the activities. A plan to ensure at least five years of funding is an essential ingredient and can help set an agenda that seeks extramural resources to augment the partnership effort.

Coordination with Other School Reform Efforts

The plethora of other school reform efforts that have swept the state since the Omnibus Education Reform Bill in 1983 provides two possible scenarios for those interested in school/college partnerships. The first is to see each of these components as separate entities; the other is to utilize the benefits of

each of the various programs in a comprehensive way. The following recommendations support a congruence between school/college partnerships and other reform efforts.

The first recommendation is for partners to determine the common threads of school reform efforts within the school/school district. This should be done by meeting the needs of the school district and reinforcing the particular organizational culture envisioned by the institutions carrying out the school/college partnership. Through the identification of common threads, opportunities for collaboration among the different efforts readily can be seen.

A second recommendation is to build the curriculum enhancement efforts of the school/college partnership around the curriculum review cycle of the school/school district/state. In California there is a set curriculum review cycle. It is recommended that this cycle serve as one component of curriculum review by the school/college partners.

The third recommendation is that school/college partners utilize specific subject matter resources. Those resources most often recommended include the California Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Program, the California Writing Project, the California Mathematics Project, and the emerging California Science Project.

Institutionalizing School/College Partnership Efforts

While CAPP provides resources for the partners to carry out school/college partnership activities for three years (for 1990-93 CAPP curriculum enhancement projects, an additional one-year planning grant was provided), the ability to institutionalize these efforts into the fabric of the school/school district and postsecondary institutions is an important component and a desired outcome of CAPP. The recommendations below are ways in which school/college partnerships can be institutionalized.

The first recommendation is that *priority items* be determined that should be ongoing from the school/college collaboration. These items will reflect the unique nature of each partnership. It is recommended that not all of the activities need to be continued, but only those which clearly meet the needs of the school/school district as well as the postsecondary partners. After these determinations are made, it is appropriate then for institutions to share costs (as noted in Chapter III, section "Sharing Costs") and to integrate school/college partnerships with other change efforts (Chapter III, section "Coordination with Other School Reform Efforts") in order to institutionalize these activities.

A second recommendation is to continue the Partnership Advisory Committee. This act in itself will serve to stimulate ongoing partnership activities.

A third recommendation is to bring into the partnership corporate/business partners. These entities should be seen as equal partners and be brought to the table in discussions of how the partnership can serve local business needs as well as school/college needs. Identification of mutual benefits for the appropriate businesses should follow the way mutual benefits are determined for schools and postsecondary institutions.

It is also recommended that those partners who developed curriculum materials to enhance academic preparation of students consider marketing those materials. Postsecondary institutions, as well as businesses, can be most helpful in determining ways that this can occur.

A final recommendation is to involve the development offices of the postsecondary education institutions early in the project to assist in developing the means to institutionalize the partnership. It is recommended that part of this activity be closely aligned with the early establishment of a partnership public relations program.

Advice to Beginning Partners

CAPP partners suggested a series of items they identified as being the most important to projects considering developing new school/college partnerships. It is recommended that the elements discussed below be the starting place for schools and postsecondary institutions who wish to consider launching partnership efforts:

- establish mutually beneficial goals and objectives;
- focus on the needs of the school/school districts to prepare students (utilizing students as the common element for both schools and postsecondary institutions);
- begin with a manageable size on one hand, and, on the other hand, have a broad vision of the ways in which the partnership can meet overall curriculum enhancement needs of the students;
- recognize the dynamic evolutionary nature of partnerships;
- provide sufficient time for the initial planning for the development of the partnership, as well as informal time so that schools and postsecondary partners can come to know each other; and
- ensure that there is sufficient support from the top to allow faculty from schools and postsecondary institutions to do the work of enhancing curriculum.

Enhancing Opportunities for Underrepresented Students

It is strongly recommended that the most effective way to enhance the academic preparation of underrepresented students is to provide curriculum reform across the school. This is the unanimous finding of partners and indicates that, with regard to curriculum, all students should be offered the same opportunities to be challenged and developed. For disadvantaged underrepresented students, the partners recommend special strategies for enhancing their performance. These include: (1) academic support, most notably tutoring, summer programs, academic advising, and (2) the provision of enrichment activities, most importantly the development of student/college related clubs, the provision of mentors, and field trips that allow students to experience the excitement of postsecondary education.

The second recommendation is to have partners work toward the abolishment of "tracking." The work of Professor Jeannie Oakes at UCLA has provided a solid research base for understanding the debilitating aspects of tracks and ways in which tracking can become appropriately dissolved. It is interesting to note that her research reflects what partners saw in their own partnership activities, i.e., these situations are specific to the institution, and that the best model for eliminating tracking is one that is developed by the institution for its own environment.

Successfully Involving Parents

A number of recommendations emerge to assist schools in involving parents with their children in academic preparation activities. The most important recommendation, as determined by the partners, is the provision of consistent, ongoing communication (presented in a variety of ways) about what academic preparation needs are and what the consequences of inadequate preparation are to their children. This needs to be done in appropriate languages and needs to focus on positive responses about their children's activities in the schools.

The second recommendation is to ensure that activities developed to bring the parents into the school include the following components:

— a social component so that families are made comfortable; include the notion of families, not simply the parents; and

— presentations that are focused on real problems parents can relate to.

It is also recommended that projects develop a cadre of parents who then can become consultants to other parents within the school. In addition, these parents can serve on appropriate partnership advisory committees.

It is recommended that partnerships engage in family academic efforts. The Family Mathematics model is strongly recommended as a way to engage families and the student in a successful learning experience.

The importance to these efforts of college clubs is cited above. These clubs can play a positive role for students. Parents can become involved, both in activities as well as by ensuring their child's and their own participation in the club, thereby utilizing a "contract" to engage the parent in certain postsecondary-related activities.

A final recommendation is for partners to make a specific goal/priority of involving parents in the partnership effort. By being clear about the importance of this element, projects can be certain to develop appropriate efforts.

Recommendations for CAPP Advisory Committee and Evaluation

Advisory Committee Recommendations

The following recommendations are made by the partners to the Advisory Committee:

1. It is recommended that the Advisory Committee conduct Focus Group sessions each spring so that partners can share with, as well as learn from, each other in a structured and powerful format.

2. It is recommended that the Advisory Committee continue to find ways to clarify its multiple roles with the projects.

3. It is recommended that the site visits, which occurred for the first time during the 1989-90 academic year, be continued.

Recommendations for Evaluation

The following recommendations are made regarding the CAPP Evaluation:

1. It is recommended that the many methods of evaluation be clarified for the project partners. Partners should understand the concept behind the evaluations and what is to be accomplished. Project partners should be well aware of why the data are needed and how the project data are utilized.

2. Partners should be informed about how the collected data can be utilized by the project in a facile manner.

3. CAPP should provide projects with an orientation/training session to give partnership participants a better understanding of evaluation in general.

4. A longitudinal study should be developed so that the long-range impact of CAPP can be determined.

Chapter IV
METHODOLOGY

This report describes the findings and recommendations of CAPP partnership projects based upon a qualitative evaluation utilizing the focus group technique. Definitions of and comments about qualitative evaluation and focus groups as well as specifics of the research design are presented below.

Comments About Qualitative Evaluation and Focus Groups

The CAPP Advisory Committee was interested in gathering specific information from the CAPP curriculum enhancement projects in addition to the quantitative data collected by the CAPP external evaluators regarding project outcomes. It also sought to determine how CAPP partners implemented, or would have implemented, their projects to achieve the best results. It determined that the best way to achieve this end was through a qualitative evaluation. Schofield and Anderson (1984) describe qualitative inquiry as having the following characteristics:

a. Is conducted in natural settings, . . .

b. Utilizes the researcher as the chief "instrument" in both data-gathering and analysis, . . .

c. Emphasizes "thick description," that is, "obtaining real, rich, deep" data which illuminate everyday patterns of action and meaning from the perspective of those being studied, . . .

d. Tends to focus on social processes rather than primarily or exclusively on outcomes, . . .

e. Employs multiple data-gathering methods, especially participant observation and interviews, and

f. Uses an inductive approach to data analysis, extracting its concepts from the mass of particular detail which constitutes the data base . . . (pp. 8-9)

Miles and Huberman (1984) suggest that "Qualitative data are attractive. They are a source of well-rounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local context" (p. 21). They assert that qualitative data analysis consists of three concurrent flows of activity: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification.

The CAPP Advisory Committee proposed a qualitative study to complement the quantitative evaluation design. A similar study was carried out in 1987 with positive results. The committee believed that information gleaned from the rich experiences of partners would provide a positive adjunct to what was learned about partnership efforts in curriculum enhancement.

The Focus Group technique has become a well-proven method of collecting data for qualitative research. Krueger (1988) defines a focus group as "a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, nonthreatening environment. . . . Group members influence each other by responding to ideas and comments in the discussion" (p. 18). The process is especially useful for gathering data from groups of people who have similar experiences but different backgrounds.

The Research Design

A qualitative evaluation design was presented to and approved by the CAPP Advisory Committee. The purposes of the evaluation were to:

- Supplement the CAPP Summative Evaluation reports that are to be based upon measurable outcomes of the intended individual project objectives as well as the overall CAPP objectives.
- Serve as a primary source of advice and guidance to new CAPP curriculum enhancement projects as well as to other partnership efforts being developed within the state and across the nation.
- Serve as a source of information regarding CAPP and its effects.
- Determine the extent to which the first set of findings from the curriculum enhancement projects was found to be effective by the second set of CAPP projects.
- Add to the literature regarding intersegmental partnership models.

In order to focus the evaluation to meet the purposes defined, a set of questions was developed. These questions were reviewed and expanded upon by the CAPP Advisory Committee and were pilot tested at a school/college partnership gathering. These questions contain items (indicated by an *) utilized in the 1987 report as well as new items. These questions are:

1. What are the best ways to realize an effective partnership between schools/school districts and postsecondary institutions?*
   - — What elements need to be in place to ensure effective school/college collaboration?
   - — What is the best administrative structure?*
   - — What are the best ways to promote postsecondary faculty and schools' faculty to work together?*
   - — What are the best ways for postsecondary faculty to assist schools to enhance curriculum and to enhance other academic preparation efforts?*
2. What are the best ways to disseminate information about the partnership project: both communications within project institutions as well as dissemination to external audiences?*
3. What are the best ways to evaluate the ongoing, as well as the end-result, effectiveness of these programs?*
4. How are non-grant funded costs shared by the partners? What ways can partners benefit from "cost-sharing"?
5. How can partnership efforts be coordinated with other school change/reform efforts?
6. What are the best ways to institutionalize (continue) the partnership effort after initial grant funding?*
7. What are the two most important pieces of advice you would give to schools and postsecondary institutions as they begin to develop partnership efforts to enhance curriculum?

8. What are the best ways to provide focused academic preparation efforts for students under-represented at four-year postsecondary institutions?*

9. What are the best ways to involve school parents in these efforts?

10. What unintended outcomes have occurred as a result of your partnership/curriculum enhancement projects?*

11. In what ways could the CAPP Advisory Committee/CAPP Statewide Director/CAPP Evaluators be more helpful?*

In March, partners from each of the CAPP curriculum enhancement projects were invited to a two-day CAPP workshop session. Four to five individuals from each project, representing both postsecondary administrators and faculty as well as school administrators and faculty, were encouraged to come. Focus Group discussions were conducted during the first day of the workshop. Prior to that session, participants received a copy of the questions to be considered, and project directors were urged to meet with the project team attending the conference so that they could discuss responses to the questions. This was done to inform the partners of the content of the Focus Group discussion as well as to provide a learning set for the Focus Group participants.

Five individuals were chosen to facilitate the Focus Group sessions. These individuals (listed in Appendix I) were selected for their experience with the Focus Group methodology. The facilitators represented schools as well as postsecondary institutions from across the state. In preparation for the workshop, facilitators received the evaluation design, a copy of the 1987 report, and the questions to be discussed in the Focus Groups.

Prior to the workshop, the qualitative evaluator placed each of the project participants into a Focus Group. These groups were mixed so that each project, to the extent possible, would be represented in each group. Additionally, persons with different perspectives, e.g., postsecondary faculty, school administrators, etc., were also included in each group. The end result was five groups: two of them with eight members each and three of them with seven members each. Also, the set of questions (stated above) was mixed so that each question would be touched upon by at least three of the Focus Groups. The night before the workshop, a three-hour training session occurred with the qualitative evaluator and Focus Group facilitators. At that session a common Focus Group strategy was agreed upon. In addition, each question was thoroughly reviewed so that the intent of the question was understood by each facilitator.

The workshop began with a plenary session designed to familiarize all participants with the purposes and process of the Focus Group sessions. One question was used to model, for the group as a whole, the way the discussion would occur in each of the small Focus Groups. The participants were asked if there were questions or concerns related to the discussion. In addition, participants were informed that the sessions would be tape recorded, unless participants wished for them not to be, and that the tape recorder could be stopped during the discussion if participants wished. Facilitators then convened their small groups, which spent approximately five hours discussing the questions.

At the end of the focus group discussions, the participants again convened in plenary session where the facilitators briefly presented feedback on the discussions of their focus groups. At this session participants were provided an opportunity to comment briefly on items chosen by the facilitators to discuss. After the plenary session, a debriefing session was held for facilitators to discuss the final step of providing written reports to the evaluator.

Within two weeks the facilitators submitted in writing reports on the outcomes of each of the Focus Group sessions as well as tapes of the discussions. The total data for this study consist of the facilitators' reports as well as the observations of the qualitative evaluator and the CAPP Director who "floated" from group to group during the workshop.

Analyzing the Data

From all of the written information a qualitative analysis was conducted. This effort would be considered a cross-site evaluation in that it reviewed data from a variety of different project sites. The specific tactics used in the content analysis of the written data included noting patterns and themes as well as clustering like items. The data responses were formatted underneath categories that matched the questions.

Once common elements were gleaned from the data, they were ranked to reflect the strength of their occurrence. The frequency with which specific items were offered by respondents is indicated in the findings.

A draft of Chapters II, *Findings*, and III, *Recommendations*, was submitted to the Focus Group facilitators as well as to the CAPP Director to ensure that the analysis was accurate and coincided with their perceptions of the information that came out of Focus Group sessions. Each of the facilitators was given the opportunity to point out gaps in the information presented or errors in the interpretation of the data. The author of this report, however, takes full responsibility for the information presented herein.

APPENDICES

A. California Assembly Bill 2398

B. List of CAPP Curriculum Enhancement Projects 1984-87

C. List of CAPP Curriculum Enhancement Projects 1987-1990

D. Characteristics of the California Academic Partnership Program Projects

E. Plan for Evaluation Sessions

F. California Academic Partnership Program Items for Spring Partnership Evaluation Workshop

G. List of Evaluation Workshop Facilitators

H. Evaluation Workshop Agenda

I. List of Focus Group Facilitators

APPENDIX A

Assembly Bill No. 2398 (1984)

CHAPTER 620

An act to amend Sections 11000, 11001, 11002, 11003, 11004, and 11005 of the Education Code, relating to schools, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

[Approved by Governor August 14, 1984. Filed with Secretary of State August 15, 1984.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2398, Hughes. California Academic Partnership Program.

Existing law authorizes the establishment of the California Academic Partnership Program, to be administered by the Trustees of the California State University for the purpose of providing academic and counseling services to pupils enrolled in grades 7 to 12, inclusive, and to increase the involvement of postsecondary educational institutions to improve the academic quality of public postsecondary schools. Existing law prescribes procedures for the establishment of an advisory committee for the purpose of making recommendations to the Chancellor of the California State University for the award of grants to projects submitted by qualified applicants in accordance with prescribed criteria to implement these provisions of existing law.

This bill would make substantial revisions to the provisions of existing law governing the administration of the California Academic Partnership Program.

This bill would require the program to be administered by the Trustees of the California State University, in cooperation with the Regents of the University of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This bill would state that the purpose of the program is to develop cooperative efforts to improve the academic quality of the public secondary schools with the objective of improving the preparation of all students for college. This bill would specify that projects funded under the provisions of this bill may address improvements in secondary school curriculum and the ability of students to benefit from these improvements.

This bill would revise the provisions of existing law governing the composition of the advisory committee appointed to assist in the selection of proposals to be funded and the development of criteria for project evaluation, as prescribed. This bill would require the advisory committee to make recommendations regarding the development of criteria for identifying projects which are ineffective, and for the development of options identifying additional resources and efforts which promote the objectives of the program.

This bill would substantially revise eligibility criteria for the submission of funding for a project grant, as prescribed. This bill would require each project receiving a grant to provide matching funds, rather than an equal dollar amount of matching funds, from existing funds received from federal, state, local, or private sources. This bill would revise the priorities for the award of project grants.

This bill would require the Chancellor of the California State University, with the assistance of the advisory committee, and the advice of faculty from appropriate disciplines, to establish a voluntary cooperative program for the academic assessment of secondary school students in the state, as prescribed.

This bill would require the California Postsecondary Education Commission to provide a progress report on the effectiveness of the California Academic Partnership Program to the Legislature on or before January 1, 1986, and would require the commission to submit a final evaluation on or before January 1, 1988, as prescribed, and would authorize the commission to identify projects which are ineffective or not cost-effective for termination.

This bill would take effect immediately as an urgency statute.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 11000 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11000. There is hereby established the California Academic Partnership Program, to be administered by the Trustees of the California State University, in cooperation with the Regents of the University of California, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The purpose of the program shall be to develop cooperative efforts to improve the academic quality of public secondary schools with the objective of improving the preparation of all students for college. Projects funded under the provisions of this chapter may address improvements in secondary school curriculum and the ability of students to benefit from these improvements. Academic partnership projects shall be distributed throughout the state in order to provide schools located in rural, urban, and suburban areas with access to these services.

SEC. 2. Section 11001 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11001. The Chancellor of the California State University shall establish an advisory committee to assist in selecting proposals to be funded and developing criteria for project evaluation. The committee shall be composed of the following members:

(a) Two certificated secondary school teachers, including at least one junior high or intermediate school teacher, appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

(b) Two certificated secondary school employees with responsibility for curriculum administration, appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

(c) One director of a regional consortium participating in the California Student Opportunity Access Program established pursuant to Chapter 113 of the Statutes of 1978, appointed by the Student Aid Commission.

(d) Two representatives of the California Community Colleges, to be appointed by the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, at least one of whom shall be a faculty member.

(e) Two representatives of the California State University, to be appointed by the Chancellor of the California State University, at least one of whom shall be a faculty member.

(f) Two representatives of the University of California, appointed by the President of the University of California, at least one of which shall be a faculty member.

(g) One representative, appointed by the Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Faculty appointments to the advisory committee shall be made by the appropriate appointing authority through consultation with the faculty senate.

SEC. 3. Section 11002 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11002. The advisory committee shall make recommendations regarding all of the following:

(a) Development of criteria for awarding grants pursuant to Section 11003.

(b) Development of criteria for determining the priority ranking of schools selected to receive assistance under the California Academic Partnership Program.

(c) Development of criteria for identifying projects which are ineffective.

(d) Development of options identifying additional resources and efforts which promote the objectives of the program.

(e) Development of a general policy for cooperative diagnostic testing of secondary students with assessment instruments commonly used by California postsecondary educational institutions.

SEC. 4. Section 11003 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11003. (a) A school district together with a postsecondary educational institution or a consortium of postsecondary educational institutions may submit a joint application to the Chancellor of the California State University for a grant to fund a project intended to improve student performance in secondary schools. The advisory committee shall give consideration to the following, in addition to its own criteria for the recommendation of programs for funding:

(1) The inclusion of a comprehensive plan for curricular revision or enhancement and instructional change.

(2) The participation of postsecondary campus faculty working as equal partners with secondary school teachers in efforts to improve the academic quality of college preparatory instruction.

(3) The provision of activities and services designed to enhance the ability of students to benefit from college preparatory curricula.

(4) The provision of in-service training designed to increase college aspirations of students from groups with low participation rates in postsecondary institutions.

(5) The inclusion of procedures for the independent evaluation of the program budget.

(6) Plans for the participation of more than one secondary school.

(7) Plans for the inclusion of intermediate or junior high schools in the project.

(8) Plans for the continuation of the project after funding ceases.

(b) Upon receipt of an application submitted pursuant to subdivision (a), the Chancellor of the California State University may award a grant to the joint applicants for purposes of funding the proposed project. Each project which receives a grant pursuant to this subdivision shall provide matching funds from existing funds received from federal, state, local, or private sources or budget increases in those funds, with preference to projects which have the strongest demonstrated institutional commitment. Priority shall be given to projects which serve either of the following:

(1) Schools and school districts utilizing the provisions of Article 4 (commencing with Section 54700) of Chapter 9 of Part 29.

(2) Schools with low student participation in institutions of post-secondary education or with a concentration of students from groups which are underrepresented in postsecondary education, affording priority to those applicants in inverse order of their level of student participation in institutions of postsecondary education authorized to award baccalaureate degrees.

(c) The Chancellor of the California State University, with the assistance of the advisory committee established under Section 11001, and with the advice of faculty from appropriate disciplines, shall establish a voluntary cooperative program for the academic assessment of secondary school students in the state. In developing this system, the chancellor shall take steps necessary to ensure that increased uses of assessment instruments assist in all of the following:

(1) Reducing the demand for remedial programs at the postsecondary level.

(2) Analyzing student readiness for college-level work.

(3) Identifying the academic needs of students for secondary school teachers and counselors.

(4) Encourage and give priority to schools identified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 11003 for the utilization of these instruments.

SEC. 5. Section 11004 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11004. The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall provide a progress report on the California Academic Partnership Program to the Legislature on or before January 1, 1986, and a final evaluation report on or before January 1, 1988. The evaluation shall include, but need not be limited to, indicators of increases in the number of students enrolled in postsecondary educational institutions, indicators of students' improved preparation for baccalaureate work, reductions in dropout rates, and the assessment of the effectiveness of the program by participating school districts and postsecondary institutions, together with recommendations from the commission for the improvement of the program.

SEC. 6. Section 11005 of the Education Code is amended to read:

11005. Based upon evaluations conducted pursuant to Section 11004, the California Postsecondary Education Commission may identify projects which are ineffective or not cost-effective for termination. Funds made available as a result of that termination shall be reallocated for the awarding of new grants pursuant to Section 11003.

SEC. 7. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:

In order to ensure that the selection processes and criteria prescribed in this act will be implemented for the California Academic Partnership Program for the 1984-85 school year, it is necessary that this act take effect immediately.

APPENDIX B

List of CAPP Curriculum Enhancement Projects 1984-1987

1. Five Star Academic Partnership: Fillmore USD. Norwalk-La Mirada USD. UCLA. UC Santa Barbara. Cerritos College.

2. A Junior MESA Program for Rural and Metropolitan Students: CSU Bakersfield. Arvin Union SD. Bakersfield College. Bakersfield SD. Earlimart SD. Fairfax SD. Fruitdale SD.

3. Ethnic Literature — A Model for Teaching Critical Thinking Skills: CSU Sacramento. Grant UHSD.

4. Language Across the Curriculum — "Learning from Text": CSU Northridge. Los Angeles USD.

5. Academic Partnership to Improve Social Studies Curriculum: Sonoma State University. Cotati-Rohnert Park University SD.

6. High School/College Partnership Produces Prepared Student: Sacramento City College. Sacramento City USD.

7. Project STEP Student/Teacher Educational Partnership: A Model for Intersegmental Cooperation: UC Irvine. Santa Ana USD. CSU Fullerton. Rancho Santiago College. Chapman College.

8. Academic Partnership — PVUSD-UCSC: UC Santa Cruz. Pajaro Valley USD.

9. Preparing Students for University Level Academic Writing: Montebello USD. UCLA.

10. The Quantitative Education Development Project (QED): San Diego City Schools. San Diego County Consortium.

11. Linking Resources for Students Underrepresented in Higher Education: Santa Barbara HSD. UC Santa Barbara. Santa Barbara CC.

12. Mathematics: New Courses in the 9-12 Academic Preparatory Sequence: UC Davis. CSU Sacramento. San Juan USD. Sacramento USD. Grant Joint USD. Elk Grove SD.

13. Academic Partnership to Improve Collegiate Preparation: UCLA. Los Angeles USD. L.A. Harbor CC.

14. College Aspiration Partnership Program: ABC USD. UC Irvine. Cerritos College.

15. The Mathematics Awareness and Skill Development Program: South Coast EOP/s Consortium. Whittier UHSD. CSPU Pomona. Rio Hondo CC. Whittier College.

16. The College Preparatory Tutorial Center Project: CSU Dominguez Hills. Centinela Valley USD. El Camino CC.

17. Comprehensive Math and Language Articulation and Tutorial Program: Southwestern College. Sweetwater UHSD. San Diego State University.

18. Science and English Curriculum Project: Newark SD. CSU Hayward. Ohlone College.

19. Social Studies and Science Curriculum Development and Implementation in Three Strands: Vacaville USD. SUCCESS Consortium. UC Davis. University of the Pacific. Sonoma State University. Solano CC.

20. SHARP: Stockton Honors Advanced-Placement Recognition Program: Stockton USD. University of the Pacific.

APPENDIX C

1987-1990
California Academic Partnership Program Curriculum Enhancement Projects
(*CAPP Showcase Projects)

1. *Academic Partnership to Develop Model Math and Science Curriculum*; Partners: CSU Bakersfield; Bishop Joint Union HSD; Delano Joint Union HSD; Porterville College; Porterville HSD.

2. *Academic Partnership for Improving Life Science Instruction and Postsecondary Access*; Partners: Samuel Merritt College of Nursing and Oakland USD.

3. *Academic Partnership to Provide Intervention Strategies Improving Academic Preparation (mathematics)*; Partners: Oroville Union HSD; Butte Community College; CSU Chico; Oroville Elementary SD.

4. *Academic Partnership in Science Education*; Partners: CSU Los Angeles; Pasadena Unified SD; Pasadena City College.

5. *Academic Partnership: Teaching for Transition from High School to College (English, social science)*; Partners: Dos Palos Joint Union HSD; CSU Stanislaus; Merced Community College; Oro Loma Elementary District.

6. *Gateways Through Academic Partnerships (mathematics, science, English)**; Partners: Pajaro Valley USD and UC Santa Cruz.

7. *Golden Eagle Academic Partnership Program (English, foreign language, mathematics, science, social science)*; Partners: CSU Los Angeles; CSU Bakersfield; University of Southern California; Los Angeles USD.

8. *Language and Content Enrichment: Academic Partnership for Curriculum Development (English, social science)*; Partners: CSU Long Beach; Huntington Beach Union HSD; Long Beach Unified SD.

9. *Mid-City Writing Project: An Across-the-Curriculum Academic Partnership*; Partners: Oakland USD; UC Berkeley; East Bay Consortium of Educational Institutions, Inc.

10. *Project STEP: An Academic Partnership for the Advancement of Learning (mathematics, science, English)**; Partners: UC Irvine; CSU Fullerton; Chapman College; Rancho Santiago Community College; Santa Ana USD.

APPENDIX D

Characteristics of the California Academic Partnership Program Projects

Project	Curricular Speciality					Groups Served		
	Math	Science	Social Science	Language Arts	Critical Thinking Skills	Grades	Number of Students 1984-87	Number of Teachers 1984-87
1. Five Star Academic Partnership	X	X				7-12	8,000	80
2. A Junior MESA Program for Rural and Metropolitan Students	X	X		X	X	7-9	900 +	80
3. Ethnic Literature: A Model for Teaching Critical Thinking Skills				X	X	8,9,10	500	
4. Language Instruction Across the Content Areas: Learning From Text				in content areas	X	6-12	2,800	240
5. Academic Partnership to Improve Social Studies Curriculum			X			11-12	500	
6. High School/College Partnership Produces Prepared Students		writing	writing	writing		7-12	5,000 +	
7. Project STEP	X	X		writing/ reading	X	9	3,800	
8. Academic Partnership	X	X	X	X		8,9,10	5,350	20
9. College Partnership Produces Prepared Students				X	X	7,9,11	300	
10. The Quantitative Educational Development Project	X	X			X	8	900	8
11. Linking Resources for Students Underrepresented in Higher Education	X			X		6-8	500	
12. Mathematics: New Course in the 9-12 Academic Preparation Sequence	X				X	7,8,12	1,000 +	40 +
13. Academic Partnership to Improve College Preparation	X	X		X		7-12	2,000 +	
14. College Aspiration Partnership Program	X			X		7-12	316	
15. The Mathematics Awareness and Skill Development Program	X					7-12	1,000 +	
16. The College Preparatory Tutorial Center Project	X			X		10	1,000 +	100 +
17. Comprehensive Math and Language Articulation and Tutorial Program	X			X		7-12	43,200	
18. Science and English Curriculum Project		X		X		11-12	1,600 +	
19. Social Studies and Science Curriculum Development in Three Strands		X	X	writing	X	6-12	700 +	30
20. Stockton Honors Advanced-Placement Recognition Program (SHARP)	X	X	X	X		10-12	2,000	
A. California State University/University of California Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Project	X					9-12	400,000 +	5,300
B. High School Diagnostic Testing Program in Composition				writing		11	2,250	
C. University of California and California State University Writing Exam for Eleventh Graders				writing		11	2,000 +	

Characteristics of the California Academic Partnership Program Projects (Continued)

Project	Interview Workshops			Tutorial		Testing	Counseling Guidance Orientation	Articulation		
	Teacher	Counselor	Parent	Peer	College Student			Curriculum	Support Service	Information
1.	X		X	X			X	X		
2.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
3.	X		X			X	X			
4.	X							X		
5.										
6.	X					X	X			
7.	X				X		X			
8.	X				X		X			
9.	X					X	X	X		
10.	X				X	X				X
11.					X		X			
12.	X					X				
13.	X	X			X	X	X			
14.			X	X			X			
15.	X			X	X	X				
16.	X				X	X	X			
17.	X		X	X						X
18.	X									
19.	X				X		X	X		
20.	X	X			X		X			
A.										
B.										
C.										

Characteristics of the California Academic Partnership Program Projects (Continued)

Project	Curriculum		Forums/Seminars			Team Teaching	Field Trips	Teacher Liaison with Parents	Summer Programs		Conferences
	Development	Revision	Teachers	Parents	Students				Teachers	Students	
1.	X		X	X	X	X			X		X
2.	X	X					X	X		X	
3.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
4.	X	X	X			X			X		
5.	X	X				X					
6.	X										
7.	X	X							X		X
8.	X	X			X					X	
9.	X	X	X				X	X			
10.	X					X					
11.	X							X		X	
12.	X		X						X		
13.			X								
14.		X				X					
15.		X				X					
16.	X						X				
17.		X			X						
18.		X									
19.	X	X	X			X				X	
20.		X									X
A.											
B.											
C.											

APPENDIX E

March 31, 1987
PLAN FOR EVALUATION SESSIONS

Purpose:

- To gather the collective perceptions of CAPP project partners regarding their successful and unsuccessful experiences in carrying out CAPP "curriculum" projects.
- To document these perceptions in a report which would serve as a:
    1. Supplement to the CAPP Final Summative Evaluation Reports which are envisioned to be based upon measurable outcomes of intended project objectives.
    2. Basis upon which the CPEC evaluator could form judgments about the effectiveness of CAPP.
    3. Source of advice and guidance to new CAPP curriculum projects as well as to others interested in partnership efforts.
    4. Source of potential distribution of information regarding CAPP and its effects.
    5. Add to the literature regarding intersegmental/partnership models.

Timing:

- Two sessions: one in Northern California, one in the South.
- Tentative Dates: April 30 (S), May 1 (N).

Format:

- Pre-session Activity
    1. Letter to each partner site project director
    2. Identify a team of individuals to attend session
    3. Team equals at least one person from *each* partner institution, and at least one faculty member/teacher and one curriculum specialist
    4. This session will serve as part of your final evaluation report
    5. Meet with team *prior* to session to discuss and bring a written response to: What have you learned (pro and con) regarding:
        a. The best way to realize an honest and effective partnership:
            - Administrative structure

- To promote faculty working with faculty
  - — Incentives for cooperation
  - — Identification of interested faculty

b. The best way to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum

c. The best way to target academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students

d. The best way to evaluate the effectiveness of the program's efforts

e. The best way to institutionalize (continue) partnership

f. The best way to disseminate information about the project:

- Within the project institutions
- To external audiences

g. Extent to which CAPP Advisory Board/Director/Evaluator have been/could have been helpful

h. Other unintended outcomes which have helped or hindered the program

- Prepare structured question/response sheets for small group session facilitators

Session Agenda:

8:30 a.m. — 10:00 a.m. — Breakfast with and training of small group facilitators

— Facilitators serve to guide discussion/collect small session information

Need: — Identify facilitators — 4 per session

— Pre-session instructions to facilitators

— Collect written responses from project directors just before the workshops begin

10:00 a.m. — 10:30 a.m. — Welcome

Opening Remarks — Purpose

- Anticipated Outcomes
- Structure of Day

Respond to Questions

10:30 a.m. — 11:30 a.m. — Plenary Working Session through items:

a. What unintended outcomes were discovered during the conduct of the project

(b. and c. if there is time)

b. What is the best way to realize an honest and effective partnership:

- Administrative structure
- To promote faculty working with faculty
- Incentives for cooperation
- Identification of interested faculty

c. What is the best way to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum:

- To model the process for the day
- To gain broad interactions on three key items

11:30 a.m. — 12:30 p.m. — Segmental Group Meetings

- One Facilitator per Group
- Four Groups:
  - Schools
  - Community Colleges
  - CSU
  - UC

  (Individuals from Independent Postsecondary Institutions can join any postsecondary group)

- To focus on issues by *segment*:

  a. The best way to realize an honest and effective partnership:

  - Administrative structure
  - To promote faculty working with faculty

- Incentives for cooperation
- Identification of interested faculty

b. The best way to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum

c. Other comments related to particular nuances of interaction with other segments

12:30 p.m. — 1:30 p.m. — Lunch at tables with individuals making up afternoon groups

- Afternoon groups (no more than 5) made up of individuals from different teams, representing various segments. *Teams assigned* by evaluator

1:30 p.m. — 3:30 p.m. — Afternoon Group Sessions

- One facilitator per group
- Groups work through items
- Items presented in various orders for each group so that each item is covered to some extent

3:30 p.m. — 4:00 p.m. — Wrap-up

- Respond to questions
- Evaluation of session
- Thank participants

Post Session:

- Collect Information from Facilitators
- Debrief Facilitators by Item
- Write Report

APPENDIX F

A California Academic Partnership Program
Items for Spring Partnership Evaluation Workshop

Each of the following items should be responded to *in writing*, and *handed in* at the workshop. Prior to the workshop please meet with those who will be attending the session to discuss these questions and develop your response.

What have you collectively learned (pro and con) regarding:

1. The best way(s) to
   - develop an Administrative Structure which will realize an honest and effective partnership.
   - promote faculty working with faculty (incentives?, identification of interested faculty?, etc.).
   - assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum.
   - target academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students.
   - evaluate the effectiveness of your project's efforts.
   - institutionalize your partnership.
   - disseminate information about the project within the project institutions; to external audiences.
2. Ways the following could be helpful to CAPP project partners: CAPP Advisory Board — director — office/evaluator have been/could have been helpful.
3. *Unintended* outcomes your project experienced as a result of your partnership.

Please identify your project by name and project director, and include the name, affiliation, and title of each person who participated in developing this response.

Thank you.

APPENDIX G

List of Evaluation Workshop Facilitators

Name	Institutional Affiliation
Valerie Bordeaux	California State University, Fullerton
Sandra Douglas	Office of the President, University of California
Penny Edgert	California-Student Opportunity & Access Program
Margaret Gaston	California State Department of Education
Barbara Paige-Pointer	California State University, Hayward
Lisa Sugimoto	Cerritos College
Randy Wold	University of California, Irvine

APPENDIX H

Evaluation Workshop Agenda

April 30, 1987
Sheraton Newport
10:00 a.m. — 4:00 p.m.

I. Welcome and Opening Remarks

II. Plenary Working Session

III. Small Group Discussions by Segment

IV. Lunch

V. Intersegmental/Interproject Small Group Discussions

VI. Facilitators Feedback Panel/Participant Discussion

VII. Closing Remarks

APPENDIX I

List of Focus Group Facilitators

ROSA DE ANDA
Specialist in High School Articulation
California Community College Chancellor's Office

CAROLYN CATES
Project Director
Far West Regional Laboratory

GEORGE HUTCHINSON
Director, Student Outreach Services
San Diego State University

DOLORES JAQUEZ
Executive Director, California — Student Opportunity and Access Program
East Bay Consortium

SUE WILBUR
Associate Director, Office of Relations with Schools and Colleges
University of California, Irvine

REFERENCES

— Anderson, S., S. Ball, R. T. Murphy and Assoc. *Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation: Concepts and Techniques for Evaluating Education and Training Programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

— California State University. *California Academic Parternship Program Mission Statement*. Long Beach, CA, 1989.

— California State University. *1987-88 Report: Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Program: A Joint Project of CSU, UC, and CAPP*. Long Beach, CA, 1988.

— California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Progress of the California Academic Partnership Program*. Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1985.

— California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Evaluation of the California Academic Partnership Program*. Sacramento, CA, 1988.

— Galligani, D. J. *Effective Relations for School/College Partnerships: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Curriculum Enhancement Projects Participating in the California Academic Partnership Program 1984-1987*. Long Beach, CA: California State University, 1987.

— Gordon, T. *Parent Effectiveness Training: A No-Lose Program for Raising Responsible Children*. New York: P. H. Hyden, 1970.

— Miles, M. B. and A. M. Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1984.

— Morgan, D. L. *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1988.

— Oakes, J. *Tracking in Secondary Schools: A Contextual Perspective*. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1987.

— Oakes, J. and M. Lipton. *Making the Best of Schools: A Handbook for Parents, Teachers, and Policymakers*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

— Schofield, J. W. and K. M. Anderson. *Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Research on Ethnic Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Paper presented at the Society for Research on Child Development Study Group on Ethnic Socialization, Los Angeles, January, 1984.

— Stenmark, J., V. Thompson, and R. Sossey. *Family Math*. Berkeley: Regents of the University of California, 1986.

— Van de Water, G. B. *The Governance of School-College Collaboratives: Lessons Learned from the EQ Models Program*. New York: The College Board, 1989.

Published by
The California State University
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4275